

AN
EXPOSITION
OF THE
APOSTLES
C R E E D.

BY JOHN PEARSON.

LONDON,
Printed by R. DANIEL, for J. WILLIAMS,
at the Sign of the Crown in St. Paul's
Church-yard, c1c,icc,l1x.

AN
EXPOSITION
OF THE
APOSTLES
CREED.

BY JOHN PEARSON.

if

Printed by R. DAVIES, for J. WILLIAMS,
at the Sign of the Crown in St. Paul's
Church-yard, Clerkenwell.



TO THE
Right Worshipfull and Well-beloved
THE
Parishioners of
S^t. CLEMENTS
EAST-CHEAPE.

*Mercy unto you, and peace, and love
be multiplied.*

IF I should be at any time un-
mindfull of your commands,
you might well esteem me un-
worthy of your continued fa-
vours; and there is some reason
to suspect I have incurr'd the in-
terpretation of forgetfulnesse, having been so
back-

The Epistle

backward in the performance of my promises. Some years have passed since I preached unto you upon such Texts of Scripture as were on purpose selected in relation to the C R E E D, and was moved by you to make those meditations publick. But you were pleased then to grant what my inclinations rather led me to, that they might be turned into an Exposition of the C R E E D it self: which partly by the difficulty of the Work undertaken, partly by the intervention of some other imployments, hath taken me up thus long, for which I desire your pardon. And yet an happy excuse may be pleaded for my delay, meeting with a very great felicity, that as Faith triumpheth in good works, so my Exposition of the Creed should be contemporary with the reedifying of your Church. For though I can have little temptation to believe that my Book should last so long as that Fabrick; yet I am exceedingly pleased that they should begin together; that the publishing of the one should so agree with the opening of the other. This I hope may perswade you to forget my slacknesse, considering ye were not ready to your own expectation; your experience tells
you

D E D I C A T O R Y.

you the excuse of *Church-work* will be accepted in building, I beseech you let it not be denied in printing.

That blessed Saint, by whose name your Parish is known, was a fellow-labourer with Saint *Paul*, and a successour of Saint *Peter*; he had the honour to be numbred in the Scripture with them *whose names are written in the book of life*, and when he had sealed the Gospell with his bloud, he was one of the first whose memory was perpetuated by the building a Church to bear his name. Thus was Saint *Clement's* Church famous in *Rome*, when *Rome* was famous for the *faith spoken of throughout the whole world*. He wrote an Epistle to the *Corinthians* infested with a schisme, in imitation of Saint *Paul*, which obtained so great authority in the Primitive times, that it was frequently read in their publick Congregations; and yet had for many hundred years bin lost, till it was at last set forth out of the Library of the late King.†

Now as by the providence of God, the memory of that Primitive Saint hath bin restored in our age, so my design aimeth at nothing else but that the Primitive Faith may be revived.

And

The Epistle

And therefore in this Edition of the Creed I shall speak to you but what Saint *Iude* hath already spoken to the whole Church, *Beloved, when I gave all diligence to vwrite unto you of the common salvation, it vvas needfull for me to vwrite unto you, that ye should earnestly contend for the Faith vvhich vvas once delivered to the Saints.* If it were so needfull for him then to write, and for them to whom he wrote to contend for the first Faith, it will appear as needfull for me now to follow his writing, and for you to imitate their earnestnesse, because the reason which he renders as the cause of that necessity is now more prevalent then it was at that time or ever since. For, saith he, *there are certain men crept in unauvares, vvho vv ere before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousnesse, denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Iesus (hrist.* The Principles of Christianity are now as freely question'd as the most doubtfull and controverted points; the grounds of faith are as safely denied, as the most unnecessary superstru-
ctions; that Religion hath the greatest advantage which appeareth in the newest dresse, as if we looked for another *Faith to be delivered to the Saints.*

D E D I C A T O R Y.

Saints. Whereas in Christianity there can be no concerning truth which is not ancient; and whatsoever is truly new is certainly false. Look then for purity in the fountain, and strive to embrace the first Faith, to which you cannot have a more probable guide then the Creed, received in all ages of the Church; and to this I refer you, as it leads you to the Scriptures, from whence it was at first deduced, that while *those vvhich are unskilfull and unstable vvrest* the words of God himself *unto their ovvn damnation*, ye may receive so much instruction as may set you beyond the imputation of unskilfulnesse, and so much of confirmation as may place you out of the danger of instability; which as it hath been the constant endeavour, so shall it ever be the prayer of him who after so many encouragements of his labours amongst you, doth still desire to be known as

Your most faithfull servant in the Lord,

J O H N P E A R S O N.

D E D I C A T O R

State. Whereas in Christianity there can be no
 concerning truth which is not ancient; and what-
 soever is truly new is certainly false. Look then
 for purity in the fountain, and strive to embrace
 the fountain to which you cannot have a more
 profitable guide than the Creed, received in all
 ages of the Church; and to this I tell you, as
 it leads you to the scriptures, from whence it
 was as it is deduced, that while what is
 a light and a guide to the words of God
 himself, who is the fountain of life, he may receive
 to much instruction as may let you beyond the
 fountain of wisdom, and to much of
 confirmation as may place you out of the dan-
 ger of infidelity; which as it hath been the
 constant endeavour to fall in ever the prayer
 of him who is the fountain of life, the fountain of his
 labours amongst you, God's will, desire to be
 known as

I am your humble servant

John Pearson



TO THE
READER.



Have in this Book undertaken an Exposition of the Creed, and think it necessary in this Preface to give a brief Account of the Work: least any should either expect to find that here which was never intended, or conceive that which they meet with such as they expected not.

The Creed without controversie is a brief comprehension of the objects of our Christian Faith, & is generally taken to contain all things necessary to be believed. Now whether all things necessary be contained there, concerneth not an Expofitor to dispute, who is obliged to take notice of what is in it, but not to enquire into what is not: whether all truths comprehended in the same be of equall and absolute necessity, we are no way forced to declare; it being sufficient as to the design of an Exposition,

The Preface

to interpret the words, & so deliver the sense, to demonstrate the truth of the sense delivered, and to manifest the proper necessity of each truth, how far and in what degree, and to what purposes it is necessary.

This therefore is the Method which I proposed to my self, and have prosecuted in every Article. First, to settle the words of each Article according to their Antiquity and Generality of reception in the Creed. Secondly, to explicate and unfold the Termes, and to endeavour a right notion and conception of them as they are to be understood in the same. Thirdly, to shew what are those truths which are naturally contained in those termes so explicated, & to make it appear that they are truths indeed, by such arguments and reasons as are respectively proper to evidence the verity of them. Fourthly, to declare what is the Necessity of believing those truths, what efficacy and influence they have in the soul and upon the life of a believer. Lastly, by a recollection of all, briefly to deliver the summe of every particular truth, so that every one when he pronounceth the Creed may know what he ought to intend, and what he is understood to professe, when he so pronounceth it.

In the prosecution of the Whole according to this Method I have considered that a Work of so generall

To the Reader.

generall a concernment must be exposed to two kinds of Readers, which though they may agree in judgement, yet must differ much in their capacities; Some there are who understand the Original Languages of the Holy Scripture, the discourses & Treatates of the ancient Fathers, the determinations of the Councils, and History of the Church of God, the constant profession of settled truths, the rise and encrease of Schismes and Heresies. Others there are unacquainted with such conceptions, and incapable of such instructions: who understand the Scriptures as they are translated: who are capable of the knowledge of the truths themselves, and of the proofs drawn from thence: who can apprehend the nature of the Christian faith with the power and efficacy of the same, when it is delivered unto them out of the word of God, and in the language which they know. When I make this difference, and distinction of Readers: I do not intend thereby that, because one of these is Learned, the other is Ignorant; for he which hath no skill of the learned languages, may notwithstanding be very knowing in the principles of Christian religion, and the reason and efficacy of them.

According to this distinction I have contrived my exposition, so that the Body of it con-

To the Reader.

reinemeth fully what can be delivered and made intelligible in the English tongue, without inserting the least sentence or phrase of any learned language, by which he which is not acquainted with it might be disturbed in his reading, or interrupted in his understanding. Not that I have selected only such notions as are common, easie, and familiar of themselves, but have endeavoured to deliver the most materiall conceptions in the most plain and perspicuous manner; as desirous to comprize the whole strength of the Work, as far as it is possible, in the body of it. The other Part I have placed in the Margin, (but so as oftentimes it taketh up more room, and yet is never mingled or confounded with the rest,) in which is contained whatsoever is necessary for the illustration of any part of the Creed as to them which have any knowledge of the Latine, Greek, and Orientall Languages, of the writings of the ancient Fathers, the doctrines of the Jews, and the History of the Church, those great advantages toward a right perception of the Christian Religion.

Now being the Creed comprehendeth the principles of our Religion, it must contain those truths which belong unto it as it is a religion, & those which concern it as it is ours. As it is a religion, it delivereth such principles as are to be acknowledged in Natural

To the Reader.

all Theology, such as no man which worshippeth a God can deny, and therefore in the proof of these I have made use of such arguments and reasons as are most proper to oppose the Atheists, who deny there is a God to be worshipped, a religion to be professed. As it is our Religion, it is Christian and Catholick: as Christian, it containeth such truths as were delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and those especially concerning Christ himself, which I have prosecuted constantly with an eye to the Jews, who obstinately deny them, expecting still another Messias to come; wherefore I shew out of the Law and the Prophets which they acknowledge, what was foretold in every particular concerning the Messias, and prove all those to be completed by that Christ in whom we believe. As our Religion is Catholick, it holdeth fast that faith which was once delivered to the Saints, and since preserved in the Church; and therefore I expound such verities in opposition to the Hereticks arising in all ages, especially against the Photinians, who of all the rest have most perverted the Articles of our Creed, and found out followers in these latter ages, who have erected a new Body of Divinity in opposition to the Catholick Theology. Against these I proceed upon such principles as they themselves allow, that is upon the word of God delivered in the Old and New

To the Reader.

Testament alledged according to the true sense, and applied by right reason: not urging the Authority of the Church which they reject, but onely giving in the Margine the sense of the Primitive Fathers, for the satisfaction of such as have any respect left for Antiquity, and are perswaded that Christ had a true Church on the earth before these times.

In that part which after the demonstration of each Truth teacheth the necessity of the believing it, and the peculiar efficacy which it hath upon the life of a Christian; I have not thought fitte to expatiate or enlarge my self, but onely to mention such effects as flow naturally & immediately from the doctrine, especially such as are delivered in the Scriptures; which I have endeavoured to set forth with all possible plainness and perspicuity. And indeed in the whole work, as I have laid the foundation upon the written Word of God, so I have with much diligence collected such places of Scripture as are pertinent to each doctrine, and with great faithfulness delivered them as they lie in the writings of those holy pen-men; not referring the Reader to places named in the Margine, (which too often I find in many books multiplied to little purpose) but producing and interweaving the sentences of Scripture into the body of my Exposition, so that the Reader may understand the strength of all my reason without any further

To the Reader.

ther enquiry or consultation. For if those words which I have produced, prove not what I have intended, I desire not any to think there is more in the places named to maintain it.

At the Conclusion of every distinct and severall Notion, I have recollected briefly and plainly the summe of what hath bin delivered in the explication of it, and put, it as it were, into the mouth of every Christian, thereby to expresse more fully his faith and to declare his profession. So that if the Reader please to put those Collections together, he may at once see and perceive what he is in the whole obliged to believe, and what he is by the Church of God understood to profess, when he maketh this publick, ancient and Orthodox Confession of Faith.

I have nothing more to adde, but onely to pray that the Lord would give you and me a good understanding in all things,

THE

THE
C R E E D.

I Believe in God the Father Almighty,
maker of heaven and earth: and in Je-
sus Christ his onely Son our Lord,
• which was conceived by the holy Ghost, born
of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pon-
tius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried,
he descended into hell, the third day he rose
again from the dead, he ascended into hea-
ven, and sitteth at the right hand of God
the Father Almighty: from thence he shall
come to judge the quick and the dead. I be-
lieve in the holy Ghost, the holy Catholick
Church, the communion of Saints, the for-
giveness of sinnes, the Resurrection of the
body, and the life everlasting.



AN
EXPOSITION
OF THE
APOSTLES CREED.

ARTICLE I.

*I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker
of Heaven and Earth.*

AS the first word *Credo, I believe*, giveth a denomination to the whole Confession of Faith, from thence commonly call'd the *Creed*; so is the same word to be imagin'd not to stand onely where it is expressed, but to be carried through the whole body of the Confession. For although it be but twice actually rehearsed, yet must we conceive it virtually prefix'd to the head of every Article; that as we say, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, so we are also understood to say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his onely Son, our Lord*; as, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, so also, *I believe the Catholick Church*. Neither is it to be joyned with every compleat Article onely, but where any Article is not a single verity, but comprehensive, there it is to be looked upon as affix'd to every part, or single truth contained in that Article: as, for example, in the the first, *I believe in God*, *I believe* that *God* to be *the Father*, *I believe* that *Father* to be *Almighty*, *I believe* that *Father Almighty*

A

to

to be the *maker of Heaven and Earth*. So that this *Credo*, *I believe*, rightly considered, multiplieth it self to no lesse then a double number of the Articles, and will be found at least 24 times contained in the *Credo*. Wherefore being a word so pregnant and diffusive, so necessary and essential to every part of our Confession of Faith, that without it we can neither have *Credo* nor Confession, it will require a more exact consideration, and more ample explication, and that in such a notion as is properly applicable to so many Truths.

Now by this previous expression, *I believe*, thus considered, every particular Christian is first taught, and then imagined to make confession of his Faith: and consequently this word so used, admits a threefold consideration. First, as it supposeth Belief or Faith which is confessed. Secondly, as it is a confession, or externall expression of that Faith so supposed. Thirdly, as both the Faith and confession are of necessary and particular obligation. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered First, what is the true nature and notion of Belief, Secondly, what the duty of confessing of our Faith, Thirdly, what obligation lies upon every particular person to believe and confesse; then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the first word of the *Credo*, then may every one understand what it is he sayes, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe*.

For the right understanding of the true nature of Christian Belief, it will be no lesse then necessary to begin with the generall notion of Faith; which being first truly stated and defined, then by degrees deduced into its severall kindes, will at last make the nature of Christian Faith intelligible, a designe, if I mistake not, not so ordinary and usual, as usefull and necessary.

Belief in generall I define to be an *Assent to that which is Credible, as Credible*. By the word ** Assent* is expressed that.

* Theodoret. de
Prov. Serm. I.

that Act, or habit of the understanding, by which it receiveth, acknowledgeth and embraceth any thing as a Truth; it being the * nature of the Soul so to embrace whatsoever appeareth true unto it, and so far as it so appeareth. Now this Assent, or Judgement of any thing to be true, being a generall Act of the understanding, and so applicable to other Habits thereof as well as Faith, must be specified by its proper Object, and so limited and determined to its proper act, which is the other part left to compleat the definition.

This Object of Faith is first exprest by *that which is Credible*, for every one who believeth any thing doth thereby without question assent unto it as to that which is Credible, and therefore all belief whatsoever, is such a kind of Assent. But though all belief be an Assent to that which is Credible, yet every such Assent may not be properly Faith, and therefore those words make not the definition compleat. For he which sees an action done knows it to be done, and therefore assents unto the Truth of the performance of it because he sees it: but another person to whom he relates it may assent unto the performance of the same action, not because himself sees it, but because the other relates it; in which case *that which is Credible* is the Object of Faith in one, of evident knowledge in the other. To make the definition therefore full, besides the materiall Object, or thing believed, we have added the formall Object, or that whereby it is believed, exprest in the last term, *as Credible*, which being taken in, it then appears that, First, whosoever believeth any thing, assenteth to something which is to him credible, and that as 'tis credible; and again, whosoever assenteth to any thing which is credible as 'tis credible, believeth something by so assenting, which is sufficient to shew the definition compleat.

Now if that which we believe be something which is credible, and the notion under which we believe be the cred-

χρὶ τῷ ἡμῶν
ἐν λόγον, πῶ-
ς ἐστὶν ἐκεί-
ος τῷ ψυχῆς
συγκατάθεσις.
Credere est
cum assensu
cogitare. Aug.
* Φιλαλήθης ἡ
ψυχὴ ἐν ποίᾳ
καὶ τὸ ψυδὸς
ἀπορρομένη
διατίθεσθαι,
ἀλλὰ καὶ φα-
νὲν ἀληθὲς
πάντως καὶ
ἐνθυμῶν.
Simplic, in 3.
Arist. de A-
nima.

ARTICLE I.

dibility of it, then must we first declare what it is to be Credible, and in what Credibility doth consist, before we can understand what is the nature of belief.

Now that is properly *Credible* which is not apparent of it self, nor certainly to be collected, either antecedently by its cause, or reverſely by its effect, and yet, though by none of these wayes, hath the attestation of a truth. For those things which are apparent of themselves, are either so in respect of our sense, as that snow is white, and fire is hot; or in respect of our understanding, as that the whole of any thing is greater then any one part of the whole, that every thing imaginable either is, or is not. The first kinde of which being propounded to our sense, one to the sight, the other to the touch, appear of themselves immediately true, and therefore are not termed *Credible*, but evident to sense; as the latter kinde propounded to the understanding, are immediately imbraced and acknowledged as truths apparent in themselves, and therefore are not called *Credible*, but *evident* to the understanding. And so those things which are * apparent are not said properly to be believed, but to be known.

* *Apparentia non habent fidem sed agnitionem.* Greg. 4. Dial. c. 5.

Again, other things though not immediately apparent in themselves, may yet appear most certain and evidently true, by an immediate and necessary connexion with something formerly known. For being every naturall cause actually applied doth necessarily produce its own naturall effect, and every naturall effect wholly dependeth upon and absolutely presupposeth its own proper cause, therefore there must be an immediate connexion between the cause and its effect. From whence it follows that if the connexion be once clearly perceived, the effect will be known in the cause, and the cause by the effect. And by these wayes proceeding from principles evidently known by consequences certainly concluding, we come to the knowledge of propositions in Mathematicks, and conclusions in other Sciences; which propositions and conclusions are not said

to

to be *Credible*, but *Scientificall*, and the comprehension of them is not *Faith*, but *Science*.

Besides some things there are, which though not evident of themselves, nor seen by any necessary connexion to their causes or effects, notwithstanding appear to most as true, by some externall relations to other truths, but yet so, as the appearing truth still leaves a possibility of falsehood with it, and therefore doth but incline to an *Assent*. In which case whatsoever is thus apprehended, if it depend upon reall Arguments, is not yet call'd *Credible*, but *Probable*: and an Assent to such a Truth, is not properly *Faith*, but *Opinion*.

But when any thing propounded to us is neither apparent to our sense, nor evident to our understanding in and of it self, neither certainly to be collected from any clear and necessary connexion with the cause from which it proceedeth, or the effects which it naturally produceth, nor is taken up upon any reall Arguments or relations to other acknowledged Truths, and yet notwithstanding appeareth to us true, not by a manifestation, but attestation of the truth, and so moveth us to assent not of it self, but by virtue of the testimony given to it; this is said properly to be *Credible*, and an *Assent* unto this, upon such *Credibility*, is in the proper notion, *Faith* or *Belief*.

Having thus defined and illustrated the nature of *Faith* in generall, so farre as it agreeth to all kinds of belief whatsoever; our method will lead us on to descend by way of division to the severall kindes thereof, till at last we come to the proper notion of *Faith* in the Christians *Confession*, the designe of our present disquisition. And being we have placed the formality of the Object of all belief in *Credibility*, it will clearly follow that a diversity of *Credibility* in the Object will proportionably cause a distinction of *Assent* in the understanding, and consequently a severall kind of *Faith*, which we have supposed to be nothing else but such an *Assent*.

Now the *Credibility* of objects by which they appear fit to be believed, is distinguishable according to the diversities of its foundation, that is, according to the different *Authority* of the *Testimony* on which it depends. For we having no other certain means of assuring our selves of the truth, and consequently no other motives of our *Assent* in matters of mere *Belief*, then the *Testimony* upon which we believe; if there be any fundamentall distinction in the *Authority* of the *Testimony*, it will cause the like difference in the *Assent*, which must needs bear a proportion to the *Authority* of the *Testimony*, as being originally and essentially founded upon it. It is therefore necessary next to consider in what the *Authority* of a *Testimony* consisteth, and so to descend to the severall kinds of *Testimonies* founded upon severall *Authorities*.

The strength and validity of every *Testimony* must bear proportion with the *Authority* of the *Testifier*: and the *Authority* of the *Testifier* is founded upon his *Ability* and *Integrity*: his *Ability* in the knowledge of that which he delivereth and asserteth, his *Integrity* in delivering and asserting according to his knowledge. For two severall wayes he which relateth or testifieth any thing may deceive us: one, by being ignorant of the truth, and so upon that ignorance mistaking, he may think that to be true which is not so, and consequently deliver that for truth which in it self is false, and so deceive himself and us; or if he be not ignorant, yet if he be dishonest or unfaithfull, that which he knowes to be false he may propound and assert to be a truth, and so though himself be not deceived, he may deceive us. And by each of these wayes, for want either of *Ability* or *Integrity* in the *Testifier*, whoso grounds his *Assent* unto any thing as a truth upon the testimony of another, may equally be deceived.

But whosoever is so *Able* as certainly to know the truth of that which he delivereth, and so faithfull as to deliver nothing but what and as he knoweth, he, as he is not deceived,

διδόντες τὴν πίστιν
καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα
ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ
ἐκείνου.

† πάντα τὰ ἐν
τῷ κόσμῳ τε-
λέμενα, καὶ τὰ
ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων
τελειῶν τῆς ἐκ-
κλησίας τῇ
πίστει περὶ
Cyril. Catech.
V. Orig. cont.
Celsus, l. 1.
Eus. de Prep.
Evang. l. 1. c. 5.
Arnob. adver.
Gent. l. 2.

no businesse prosecuted without this; † all secular affairs are transacted, all great achievements are attempted, all hopes, desires, and inclinations are preserved by this Humane Faith, grounded upon the Testimony of man.

In which case we all by easie experience may observe the nature, generation, and progresse of *Belief*. For in any thing which belongeth to more then ordinary knowledge, we believe not him whom we think to be ignorant, nor do we assent the more for his assertion, though never so confidently delivered: but if we have a strong opinion of the knowledge and skill of any person, what he affirmeth within the compasse of his knowledge that we readily assent unto, and while we have no other ground but his affirmation, this *Assent* is properly *Belief*. Whereas if it be any matter of concernment in which the interest of him that relateth or affirmeth any thing to us is considerable, there it is not the skill or knowledge of the relatour which will satisfie us, except we have as strong an opinion of his fidelity and integrity: but if we think him so just and honest, that he hath no designe upon us, nor will affirm any thing contrary to his knowledge for any gain or advantage, then we readily assent unto his affirmatiions, and this *Assent* is our *Belief*. Seeing then our *Belief* relies upon the ability and integrity of the Relatour, and being the knowledge of all men is imperfect, and the hearts of all men are deceitfull, and so their integrity to be suspected, there can be no infallible universall ground of *Humane Faith*.

1 Jo. 3.9.
Rom. 3.5.

But what we cannot find in the testimony of man, we may be satisfied in the testimony of God. *If we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater. Yea, let God be true, the ground of our Divine, and every man a liar, the ground of our Humane Faith.*

As for the other member of the Division, we may now plainly perceive that it is thus to be defined. *Divine Faith is an Assent unto something as Credible upon the*

the Testimony of God. This Assent is the highest kind of Faith, because the Object hath the highest Credibility, because grounded upon the Testimony of God which is Infallible. Balaam could tell Balak thus much, *God is not a man that he should lie*; and a better Prophet confirm'd the same truth to Saul, *The strength of Israel will not lie*, and because he will not, because he cannot, he is the strength of Israel, even *my God, my strength, in whom I will trust*. Num. 23. 19. 1 Sam. 15. 19. Psal. 18. 2.

For first, God is of infinite knowledge and wisdom, as Hannah hath taught us, *the Lord is a God of knowledge*, or rather, if our language will bear it, of knowledges, which are so plurall, or rather infinite in their plurality, that the Psalmist hath said, *of his understanding there is no number*. He knoweth therefore all things, neither can any truth be hid from his knowledge, who is essentially truth and essentially knowledge, and as so, the cause of all other truth and knowledge. Thus the understanding of God is infinite in respect of * comprehension, and not so onely, but of certainty also and evidence. Some things we are said to know which are but obscurely known, we see them but as in a glasse or through a cloud; But *a God is light, and in him is no darknesse at all*: he seeth without any obscurity, and whatsoever is propounded to his Understanding is most clear and evident, *neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do*. Wherefore being all things are within the the compasse of his knowledge, being all things which are so, are most clear and evident unto him, being the knowledge he hath of them is most certain and infallible, it inevitably followeth that he cannot be deceiv'd in any thing.

Secondly, the justice of God is equall to his knowledge; nor is his holiness inferiour to his wisdom: *a God of truth, saith Moses, and without iniquity, just and right is he*. Deut. 32. 4. From which internall, essentiall and infinite rectitude, goodnesse and holinesse, followeth an impossibility to de-

R

clare

1 Sam. 2. 3.
אל דעות
ידוהו

Lxx. 385
γνώσκων κα-
εως.

Psal. 147. 5. in
the Heb.

לתבונתו
אין מספר

* Cujus sapien-
tia simpliciter
multiplex, &
uniformiter
multiformis in-
comprehensibilis
comprehensione
omnia incom-
prehensibilia
comprehendit.

August. de Civ.
Dei. l. 12. c. 18.
a 1 Jo. 1. 5.
b Heb. 4. 13.

* *ἴσχυαι* ἢ
καθ' ἡμᾶς
πᾶντα ὁ θεός,
ἀνεξάντιστα
ἴσχυαι, καὶ
τὸ ἀγαθόν
ἴσχυαι, καὶ σπουδὴ
ἴσχυαι ἐκ ἑ-
ἰς αὐτοῦ. Orig.
contra Celsum.
 † *Si velint in-*
venire quod
omnipotens non
potest, habent
proferam, ego di-
cam, mentiri
non potest.
S. Aug. de Civ.
Dei. l. 22. c. 25.
a 2 Tim. 2. 13.
b Heb. 6. 17.
18.
c Heb. 6. 13.
 * *Ne sit omnium*
potens, mori non
potest, falli non
potest, mentiri
non potest.
Aug. de Symb.
ad Catechum.
 † *Deus facere*
fraudem nescit,
patri non potest.
Chrysol.
Serm. 62.

clare or deliver that for truth, which he knoweth not to be true. For if it be against that finite purity and integritie which is required of man, to lie, and therefore sinfull, then must we conceive it absolutely inconsistent with that transcendent purity and infinite integrity which is essentiall unto God. Although therefore the power of God be infinite, though he *can do all things*: yet we may safely say, without any* prejudice to his Omnipotency, that he † can not speak that for truth which he knoweth to be otherwise. For the perfections of his will are as necessarily infinite as those of his understanding, neither can he be unholy or unjust, more then he can be ignorant or unwise. *“If we believe not, yet he abideth faithfull, he cannot deny himself.* Which words of the Apostle, though properly belonging to the promises of God, yet are as true in respect of his assertions; neither should he more deny himself in violating his fidelity, then in contradicting his veracity. *‘Tis true, that God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath, that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation:* but ‘tis as true, that all this confirmation is onely for our consolation, otherwise it is as impossible for God to lie without an oath, as with one; for being he can^c swear by no greater, he sweareth onely by himself, and so the strength even of the Oath of God relieth upon the Veracity of God. Wherefore being God as God is of infinite rectitude, goodnesse and holinesse, being it is manifestly repugnant to his purity, and inconsistent with his integrity, to deliver any thing contrary to his knowledge, it clearly followeth that he cannot deceive any man. It is therefore most infallibly certain, that God being infinitely wise, cannot * be deceived, being infinitely good, cannot † deceive: and upon these two immoveable pillars standeth the Authority of the *Testimony* of God. For since we cannot doubt of the witness of any one, but by que-

questioning his ability, as one who may be ignorant of that which he affirmeth, and so deceived; or by excepting against his integrity, as one who may affirm that which he knoweth to be false, and so have a purpose to deceive us: where there is no place for either of these exceptions, there can be no doubt of the truth of the Testimony. But where there is an intrinsecall * repugnancy of being deceived in the Understanding, and of deceiving in the Will, as there certainly is in the understanding and will of God, there can be no place for either of those exceptions, and consequently there can be no doubt of the truth of that which God testifieth. And whosoever thinketh any thing comes from him, and assenteth not unto it, must necessarily deny him to be wise or holy: || *He that believeth not God, saith the Apostle, hath made him a liar.* That truth then which is testified by God, hath a *Divine Credibility*: and an Assent unto it as so *Credible*, is *Divine Faith*. In which the material Object is the Doctrine which God delivereth, the formall Object is that *Credibility* founded on the † Authority of the deliverer. And this I conceive the true nature of *Divine Faith* in generall.

Now being the *Credibility* of all which we believe is founded upon the *Testimony* of God, we can never be sufficiently instructed in the notion of *Faith*, till we first understand how this testimony is given to those truths which we now believe. To which end it will be necessary to give notice that the *Testimony* of God is not given unto truths before questioned or debated, nor are they such things as are first propounded and doubted of by man, and then resolved and confirm'd by interposing the authority of God; but he is then said to witnesse when he doth propound, and his *testimony* is given by way of *Revelation*, which is nothing else but the delivery or speech of God unto his Creatures. And therefore upon a diversity of delivery must follow a difference, though not of *Faith* it self, yet of the means and manner of *Assent*.

* *Autoritas Dei consistit in intrinseca repugnancia deceptionis seu falsitatis quam habet divinum iudicium, & in intrinseca repugnancia actus voluntatis imperantis testimonium extrinsecum non consentiens iudicio interno, quia per terminos positivos actus intellectus in salubriter veri, & actus voluntatis intrinsece & necessario recti poteris explicari.*

Francisc. de Ovidio Tract. de Fide Contr. 2. punc. 2. || 1 Job. 5. 10. † *Divina est Autoritas cui credimus, divina est doctrina quam sequimur.* Leo, Ser. 7. in Nativ.

* Sicut duplex est auditus & locutio, scilicet exterior sive corporalis, & interior ac spiritalis, ita duplex est fides, una quae oritur in cordibus fidelium per auditum exteriorem, cum scilicet Deus per aliquos homines aliis credenda proponit; & ista est fides quae nobis sive communis statui fidelium convenit, ex eo quod adhaeremus revelationibus Prophetarum & Apostolorum factis: alia est quae oritur in aliquibus per spiritualem locutionem, quae Deus aliquibus per internam inspirationem credenda revelat, nullo hominis ministerio utens, sicut est

fides Apostolorum & Prophetarum, qui ab ipso Deo per intrinsecam illuminationem sunt de credendis instructi. Francisc. Ferrariensis in Thom. cont. Gent. c. 40. * Heb. 11. 7. [†] *ἡ ἀπάντησις*, which word comes from the original *ἡ ἀπάντησις*, appropriated by the Greeks to an Oracle, or answer given by God, *ὁ μὲν δὲος ἡ ἀπάντησις*, *ὁ δὲ ἀν- ἀπάντησις* *μαρτυρεῖται*. Josephus.

Wherefore it will be further necessary to observe, that divine *Revelation* is of two kinds, either Immediate or Mediate. An Immediate *Revelation* is that by which God delivereth himself to man by himself without the intervention of man. A Mediate *Revelation* is the conveyance of the counsel of God unto man by man. By the first he spake unto the Prophets, by the second in the Prophets, and by them unto us. Being then there is this difference between the revealing of God unto the Prophets and to others, being the Faith both of Prophets and others relieth wholly upon divine *Revelation*, the difference of the manner of *Assent* in these severall kinds of believers will be very observable for the explanation of the nature of our Faith.

Those then to whom God did immediately speak himself, or by an angel representing God, and so being in his stead, and bearing his name (of which I shall need here to make no distinction) those persons, I say, to whom God did so reveal himself, did by virtue of the same *Revelation* perceive, know and assure themselves that he which spake to them was God; so that at the same time, they clearly understood both what was delivered, and by whom: otherwise we cannot imagine that *Abraham* would have slain his son, or have been commended for such a resolution, had he not been most assured that it was God who by an immediate *revelation* of his will clearly commanded it. * Thus by faith *Noah* being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an Ark, to the saving of his house: which [†] warning of God was a clear *Revelation* of Gods determination to drown the world, of his will to save him and his family, and of his command, for that end to build an Ark. And this

Noah

Noah so received from God, as that he knew it to be an oracle of God, and was as well assured of the Authour, as informed of the command. Thus the judgements hanging over Judah were revealed in the eares of *Isaiah* *Isa. 22. 14.* by the Lord of hosts. Thus the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh: at first indeed he knew him not, that is, when the Lord spake, he knew it not to be the voice of God, Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet reveal'd unto him; but after that he knew him, and was assured that it was He which spake unto him, the Scripture teaching us that the * eares of Samuel were revealed, and the word of God revealed, and || God himself revealed to him. By all which we can understand no less, then that Samuel was so illuminated in his prophecies, that he fully understood the words or things themselves which were delivered, and as certainly knew that the deliverer was God: so Samuel the Seer, so the rest of the Prophets believ'd those truths revealed to them by such a Faith as was a firm Assent unto an object credible upon the immediate Testimony of God.

But those faithfull people to whom the Prophets spake, believed the same truth, & upon the testimony of the same God, delivered unto them not by God, but by those Prophets, whose words they therefore assented unto as certain truths, because they were assured that what the Prophets spake was immediately revealed to them by God himself, without which assurance no faith could be expected from them. When God appear'd unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, & there immediately revealed to him first himself, saying, *I am the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, & the God of Jacob,* & then his will, to bring the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, Moses clearly believed God both in the Revelation of himself and of his will, & was fully satisfied that the Israelites should be delivered, because he was assured it was God who promised their deliverance: yet notwithstanding

1 Sam. 3. 21.

יהוה גלה *

אין אין

למואל

κύριος ἀπεκ-

λυσε τὸ ὄψι-

ον Σαμουηλ,

1 Sam. 9. 15.

† טרם וגלה

אליו דבר

יהוה

ἐπὶ ἧ σποκα-

λυφθῆναι αὐ-

τὸ ῥῆμα κυ-

εῖς, 1 Sam. 3. 7.

† וגלה יהוה

אל מואל

ἀπεκαλύφθη

κύριος πρὸς

Σαμουηλ,

1 Sam. 3. 21.

Exod. 3. 2.

ing still he doubted whither the Israelites would believe the same truth, when it should be delivered to them not immediately by God, but by *Moses*. And *Moses* answered and said, *But behold they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee.* Which words of his first suppose that if they had heard the voice of God, as he had, they would have assented to the truth, upon a testimony divine, and then as rationally affirme, that it was improbable they should believe, except they were assured it was God who promised, or think that God had promised by *Moses*, only because *Moses* said so. Which rationally objection was clearly taken away when God endued *Moses* with power of evident and undoubted miracles; for then the Rod which he carried in his hand was as infallible a sign to the Israelites that God had appeared unto him, as the flaming bush was to himself; and therefore they which saw in his hand God's omnipotency, could not suspect in his tongue God's veracity, inasmuch as when *Aaron* became to *Moses* in stead of a mouth, and *Moses* to *Aaron* in stead of God, *Aaron* spake all the words which the Lord had spoken unto *Moses*, and did the signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed. For being perswaded by a lively and active presence of Omnipotency that God had appeared unto *Moses*, and what was delivered to them by him, came to him from God; and being sufficiently assured out of the very sense and notion of a Deity, that whatsoever God should speak must of necessity be true, they presently assented and believed the Lord and his servant *Moses*: *Moses* as the immediate propounder, God as the originall revealer: they believed *Moses* that God had revealed it, & they believed the promise because God had revealed it. So that the Faith both of *Moses* and the Israelites, was grounded upon the same testimony or revelation of God, and differed onely in the proposition or application of the testimony; *Moses* receiving it immediately from God himself,

self, the Israelites mediately by the ministry of *Moses*.

In the like manner the succeeding Prophets were the instruments of divine Revelation, which they first believed as revealed to them, and then the people as revealed by them: for what they delivered was not the testimony of man, but the testimony of God deliver'd by man. *It was he who spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets which have been since the world began*: the mouth, the instrument, the articulation was theirs, but the words were Gods. *The spirit of the Lord spake by me*, saith *David*, and his word *was in my tongue*. It was the word of the Lord, which he spake *by the hand of Moses*, and *by the hand of his servant Ahijah the Prophet*. The hand the generall instrument of man, the mouth the particular instrument of speech, both attributed to the Prophets as merely instrumentall in their prophecies. The words which *Balaam's* asse spake were as much the asses words, as those which *Balaam* spake were his; for *the Lord opened the mouth of the asse*, and *the Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth*; and not onely so, but a bridle with that word, *onely the word that I shall speak unto thee that thou shalt speak*. The Prophets as they did not frame the notions or conceptions themselves of those truths which they delivered from God, so did they not loosen their own tongues of their own instinct or upon their own motion, but as moved, impelled, and acted by God. So we may in correspondence to the antecedent and sublequent words interpret those words of *S. Peter*, *that no prophesie of the scripture is of any * private interpretation*; that is, that no Prophecie which is written did so proceed from the Prophet which spake or wrote it, that he of himself or by his own instinct did open his mouth to prophesie: but that all propheticall revelations came from God alone, and that whosoever first delivered them was antecedently inspired by him, as it followeth, *for the prophesie came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost*. That therefore:

Luke 1. 70.

2 Sam. 23. 2.

1 Kin. 8. 53.

1 Kin. 14. 18.

Numb. 22. 28.

Numb. 23. 5.

Numb. 22. 35.

2 Pet. 1. 20.

** ἰδιωτικῆς ἀντιλήψεως.*

therefore which they delivered as the word, the Revelation of God; which they assented unto as to a certain and infallible truth, credible upon the immediate testimony of God, and to which the rest of the believers assented upon the same testimony of God mediately delivered by the hands of the prophets.

Heb. 1. 1.

Thus God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, and by so speaking propounded the Object of Faith both to the Prophets and the Fathers, hath in these last dayes spoken unto us by his Son, and by so speaking hath enlarged the object of Faith to us by him, by which means it comes to be the Faith of Jesus. Thus the only begotten Son, who

Rev. 14. 12.

Joh. 1. 18.

Heb. 1. 3.

Col. 1. 19.

Col. 2. 9.

Joh. 16. 30.

was in the bosome of the Father, the expresse image of his person, he in whom it pleased the Father that all fulnesse should dwell, he in whom dwelleth all the fulnesse of the Godhead bodily, revealed the will of God to the Apostles, who being assured that he knew all things, and convinced that he came forth from God, gave a full and clear assent unto those things which he delivered, and grounded their Faith upon his words as upon the immediate testimony of God. I have given unto them, saith Christ unto his Father, the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. Be-

Joh. 17. 8.

Joh. 16. 13.

Joh. 14. 26.

side this delivery of these words by Christ to the Apostles, they received the promise of the Spirit of truth which should guide them into all truth, and teach them all things, and bring all things into their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them. So clearly, so fully, so constantly were they furnish'd with divine illuminations & revelations from God, upon which they grounded their own faith; that each of them might well make that profes-

2 Tim. 1. 12.

sion of S Paul, I know whom I have believed. Thus the Faith of the Apostles, as of Moses and the Prophets, was grounded upon the immediate Revelations of God.

But

But those Believers to whom the Apostles preached, and whom they converted to the faith, believed the same truths which were revealed to the Apostles, though they were not so revealed to them as they were unto the Apostles, that is, immediately from God. But as the *Israelites* believed those truths which *Moses* spake, to come from God, being convinced by the constant supply of miracles wrought by the Rod which he carried in his hand: so the blessed Apostles being so plentifully endued from above with the power of miracles, gave sufficient testimony that it was God which spake by their mouthes, who so evidently wrought by their hands. They which heard *S. Peter* call a lame man unto his legs, speake a dead man alive, and strike a living man to death with his tongue, as he did *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, might easily be perswaded that it was God who spake by his mouth, and conclude that where they found him in his omnipotency, they might well expect him in his veracity. These were the persons for whom our Saviour next to the Apostles prayed, because by a way next to that of the Apostles they believed. *Neither pray I for these alone saith Christ, Joh. 17. 20. but for them also who shall believe on me through their word.* Thus the Apostles believed on Christ through his own word, and the primitive Christians believed on the same Christ through the Apostles word: and this distinction our Saviour himself hath clearly made; not that the word of the Apostles was really distinct from the word of Christ, but onely it was called theirs because delivered by their ministry, otherwise it was the same word which they had heard from him, and upon which they themselves believed. *That which was from the beginning, saith S. John, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life. That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you. 1 Joh. 1. 1. 3.* And this was the true foundation of faith in all them which believed, that they took not
C the

- the words which they heard from the Apostles to be the words of the men which spake them, no more then they did the power of healing the sick, or raising the dead, and the rest of the miracles to be the power of them that wrought them; but as they attributed those miraculous works to God working by them, so did they also that saving word to the same God speaking by them. When *S. Paul* preached at *Antioch*, *almost the whole city came together to hear the word of God*; so they esteemed it, though they knew him a man whom they came to hear speak it. This the Apostle commendeth in the *Thessalonians*, that *when*
- 1 Thes. 2. 13.* *they received the word of God, which they heard of him, they received it not as the word of man, but as it is in truth, the word of God, and receiving it so; they embraced it as coming from him who could neither deceive nor be deceived, and consequently as infallibly true, and by so embracing it they assented unto it, by so assenting to it they believed it, ultimately upon the testimony of God, immediately upon the testimony of S. Paul, as he speaks*
- 2 Thes. 1. 10.* *himself, because our testimony among you was believed.* Thus the Faith of those which were converted by the Apostles was an Assent unto the word as Credible upon the testimony of God, delivered to them by a testimony Apostolicall. Which being thus clearly stated, we may at last descend into our own condition, & so describe the nature of our own Faith, that every one may know what it is to believe.
- Although *Moses* was endued with the power of miracles, and conversed with God in the Mount, and spake with him face to face at the doore of the Tabernacle, although upon these grounds the Israelites believed what he delivered to them, as the word of God; yet neither the Miracles nor *Moses* did for ever continue with them, and notwithstanding his death, they & their posterity to all generations were obliged to believe the same truths. Wherefore it is observable which *S. Stephen* saith, *he received the lively oracles to give unto them*; the Decalogue he received from
- Acts 7. 37.*

from the hand of God, *written with the finger of God*; the rest of the divine patefactions he wrote himself, and so delivered them not a mortall word to dy with him, but *living oracles* to be in force when he was dead, and oblige the people to a belief, when his Rod had ceas'd to broach the Rocks, and divide the Seas. Neither did he onely try them to a belief of what he wrote himself, but by foretelling & describing the prophets which should be rais'd in future ages, he put a further obligation upon them to believe their prophesies as the revelations of the same God. Thus all the Israelites in all ages believed *Moses*, while he lived, by believing his words, after his death, by believing his writings. *Had ye believed Moses*, saith our Saviour, *ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me.* But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words? Wherefore the Faith of the Israelites in the land of Canaan was an Assent unto the truths of the law as credible upon the testimony of God, delivered unto them in the writings of Moses & the Prophets.

λογια ζωητα?

Joh. 5. 46, 47.

In the like manner is it now with us. For although Christ first published the Gospel to those who beheld his glory, the glory as of the onely begotten of the Father, although the Apostles first converted those unto the faith, who heard them speak with tongues they never learn'd, they never heard before, & discover the thoughts of men they never saw before, who saw the lame to walk, the blind to see, the dead to revive, and the living to expire at their command: yet did not these Apostles prolong their lives by virtue of that power which gave such testimony to their doctrine, but rather shortened them by their constant attestation to the truth of that doctrine further confirmed by their death. Nor did that power of frequent & ordinary miraculous operations long survive them, and yet they left as great an obligation upon the Church in all succeeding ages to believe all the truths which they delivered, as they had put upon those persons who heard their words, and saw their works; because they wrote the same truths which they spake, assisted in writing

Joh. 1. 14.

Job. 15. 15.

Job. 2. 23.

John. 20. 31.

by the same Spirit by which they spake, and therefore require the same readines of assent so long as the same truths shall be preserved by those writings. While *Moses* lived, and spake as a Mediatour between God and the Israelites, they believed his words, and so the prophets while they preached. When *Moses* was gone up to mount *Nebo*, and there died, when the rest of the prophets were gathered to their fathers, they believed their writings, and the whole object of their faith was contained in them. When the Son of God came into the world to reveal the will of his Father, when he *made known unto the Apostles as his friends all things that he had heard of the Father*, then did the Apostles believe the writings of *Moses*, and the prophets, and the words of Christ, and in these taken together was contained the entire object of their faith, *and they believed the Scripture & the word which Jesus had said*. When Christ was ascended up into heaven, and the Holy Ghost come down, when the words which Christ had taught the Apostles, were preached by them, and many thousand souls converted to the faith, they believed the writings of the Prophets and the words of the Apostles, and in these two was comprised the compleat object of their faith. When the Apostles themselves departed out of this life, and confirmed the truth of the gospel preached by the last of sufferings, their death, they left the summe of what they had received in writing for the continuation of the Faith in the Churches which they had planted, and the propagation thereof in other places, by those which succeeded them in their ordinary function, but were not to come near them in their extraordinary gifts. *These things were written*, saith *S. John*, the longest liver and the latest writer, *that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name*.

Those Christians then which have lived since the Apostles death, and never obtain'd the wish of *S. Augustine*, to see either Christ upon earth, or *S. Paul* in the pulpit, have

have believed the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, of the Apostles and Evangelists; in which together is fully comprehended whatsoever may properly be termed matter of divine Faith, and so *the household of God is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, who are continued unto us onely in their writings, and by them alone convey unto us the truths which they received from God, upon whose testimony we believe. And therefore he which put their writings into the definition of Faith, considering Faith as now it stands with us, is none of the smallest of the * Schoolmen. From whence we may at last conclude that the true nature of the Faith of a Christian, as the state of Christ's Church now stands and shall continue to the end of the world, consists in this, that it is *an Assent unto truths credible upon the testimony of God delivered unto us in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets.*

To believe therefore, as the word stands in the Front of the Creed, and not onely so, but is diffused through every Article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God (who by reason of his infinite knowledge cannot be deceiv'd, and by reason of his transcendent holiness cannot deceive) and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets immediately inspired, moved, and acted by God, out of whose writings this brief summe of necessary points of Faith was first † collected. And as this is properly to *believe*, which was our first consideration, so to say *I believe*, is to make a Confession or externall expression of the Faith, which is the second Consideration propounded.

Faith is an habit of the intellectuall part of man, and therefore of it self invisible, and to *believe* is a spirituall act, and consequently immanent and internall, & known to no man but him who believeth: *For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the Spirit of a man which is in him?* Wherefore Christ being not onely the great Apostle

*Eph. 2. 20. Prophetarum & Apostolorum super quos omnium Ecclesiarum fundamenta locantur. S. Hier. in Psal. 117. Super Prophetas edificatur orbis terrarum credent in Domino. Ruff. ib. * Durand. l. 3. Dist. 24. q. 1. §. 9. Vides est habitus quo assentimus dictis Scripturae propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis. Ἰὺ χ ὧς ἔδοξε ἀνθρώποις συνστῆναι τὰ τήν σεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πόλεως ἡραφῆς τὰ κασεῖωσάτα. Σύλλεχθῆναι μὲν ἀναμνηροῖ τ' ἰπίσεως διδάσκαλῶν. Cyril. Cates. 5. Ecclesiarum Patres de populorum salute solliciti ex diversis voluminibus Scripturarum collegunt testimonia divinis gravida Sacramentis. Euseb. Gall. in Symb. 61 Cor. 2. 11.*

^a Act. 8. 36, 37.

^b Rom. 10. 10.

Habes homo

unde credere

debeas, corde

fit confessio ad

justitiam, habes

unde debeas

confiteri, ore

confessio fit ad

salutem. Chry-

sol. Serm. 56.

^{*} Sermo creat

auditum, audi-

us concipit fi-

dem, credulita-

tem parituri fi-

des, confessio-

nem credulitas

nutrit, confessio

perpetuam dat

salutem, Chry-

sol. Serm. 60.

^c Matt. 12. 34.

[†] Magnum, fili-

oli, per hoc fidei

nostra videmus

esse compendi-

um, quando in-

ter cor & lin-

guam totum

salutis humana

versatur &

geritur Sacra-

mentum. Chry-

sol. Serm. 56.

Quod à te &

pro te reposci-

tur, intra te est,

i.e. oris famu-

latus & cordis

affectus. Euseb.

Gall.

^a Rom. 10. 9.

sent to deliver these revealed truths, and so the authour of our faith, but also the head of the Church, whose body consisteth of faithfull members, and so the authour of union and communion, which principally hath relation to the unity of faith, he must needs be imagin'd to have appointed some externall expression and communication of it: especially considering that the sound of the Apostles was to go forth unto the ends of the world, and all nations to be called to the profession of the Gospel, and gathered into the Church of Christ, which cannot be performed without an acknowledgement of the truth, and a profession of faith, without which no entrance into the Church, no admittance to Baptism. *What doth hinder me to be baptiz'd?* saith the Eunuch. *And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* So believing with all his heart, as Philip required, and making profession of that faith, he was admitted. *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* The belief of the heart is the internall habit residing in the soul, and act of faith proceeding from it, but terminated in the same; the confession of the mouth is an externall signification of the inward habit or act of faith, by words expressing an acknowledgement of those truths which we believe or assent to in our souls. * The ear receiveth the word, faith cometh by hearing, the ear conveyeth it to the heart, which being opened receiveth it, receiving believeth it, *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.* In the heart faith is seated, with the tongue confession is made, between these two salvation is compleated. *If thou shalt confesse with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* This faith of the heart every one ought, and is presum'd to have, this confession of the mouth every one is known to make, when he pronounceth these words of the Creed, *I believe;*

believe; and if true, he may with comfort say, *the word of* ^{1 Rom. 10. 8.}
faith is nigh me, even in my mouth and in my heart: first *de hoc sine du-*
in my heart really assenting, then in my mouth clearly and *bio legimus per*
sincerely professing with the prophet *David*, *I have be-* ^{prophetam, prope}
lieved, therefore have I spoken. Thus briefly from the ^{est inquit, in ore}
second Consideration concerning Confession implied in ^{tuo, & in corde}
the first words *I believe*, we shall passe unto the third ^{tuo, Euf. Gall.}
Consideration, of the necessity and particular obligation to ^{1 Psal. 116. 10.}
such a Confession.

If there were no other argument, yet being the Object
of faith is supposed infallibly true, and acknowledged to
be so by every one that believeth, being it is the nature of
truth not to hide it self, but rather to desire the light that it
might appear, this were sufficient to move us to a *Confessi-*
on of our *Faith*. But beside the nature of the thing, we shall
find many arguments obliging, pressing, urging us to such
a profession. For first, from the same God, and by the same
means by which we have received the Object of our faith,
by which we came under a possibility of faith, we have also
received an expresse command to make a *Confession* of the
same; *Be ready*, saith *S. Peter*, *alwayes to give an answer*
to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in ^{1 Pet. 3. 14.}
you. Secondly, 'tis true indeed that the great promises of
the Gospel are made unto faith, and glorious things are
spoken of it; but the same promises are made to the *confes-*
sion of faith together with it; and we know who it is hath
said, *Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I con-* ^{1 Rom. 10. 10.}
fesse also before my Father which is in heaven. Besides, the ^{Matt. 10. 32.}
profession of the faith of one Christian confirmeth and edi-
fieth another in his, and the mutual benefit of all layeth an
obligation upon every particular. Again, the matters of
faith contain so much purity of doctrine, perswade such
holinesse of life, describe God so infinitely glorious, so
transcendently gracious, so loving in himself, so mercifull in
his Son, so wonderfull in all his works, that the sole confes-
sion of it glorifieth God; and how can we expect to enter
into,

^a Luk. 9. 26.

^{*} Ambr. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 7.

Concil. Tol. 2.

† Concil. Laod.

Can. 46. Concil. Agath. cap. 13.

Concil. Bracar. 2. Can. 1.

Concil. 6. in

Trul. Can. 78.

It appears in the ancient

Greek Litur-

gies, and the

decree of the

third Council of

Toledo, ut omni

sacrificii tem-

pore ante com-

munionem cor-

poris Christi

& sanguinis,

juxta Orienta-

lium partium

morem una-

nimiter cla-

ra voce sacra-

tissimum fidei

recenseant

Symbolum.

^{*} Concil. 110-

gunt. c. 45.

Symbolum

quod est signa-

culum fidei, &

Orationem Do-

minicam disce-

re semper ad-

moneant sacer-

dores populum

Christianum.

^b Jo. 9. 35.

^c 38.

into that glory which is none of ours, if we deny God that glory which is his? Lastly, the concealing those truths which he hath revealed, the not acknowledging that faith which we are thought to believe, is so farre from giving God that glory which is due unto him, that it dishonoureth the faith which it refuseth or neglecteth to professe, and casteth a kind of contumely upon the authour of it, as if God had revealed that which man should be ashamed if God had revealed that which man should be ashamed to acknowledge. Wherefore he that came to save us, hath also said unto us, ^a *Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy Angels.* Such a necessity there is of Confession of Faith, in respect of God, who commanded it, and is glorifi'd in it, in respect of our selves, who shall be reward. ed for it, & in respect of our brethren, who are edified and confirmed by it. Which necessity the wisdom of the Church in former ages hath thought a sufficient ground to command the recitation of the *Creed* at the ^{*} first initiation into the Church by Baptisme, (for which purpose it was taught and expounded to those which were to be baptized, immediately before the great solemnity of Easter) and to require a particular repetition of it publicly as often as the sacrament of the *Eucharist* was administered, and a constant and perpetuall inculcation of the same by the ^{*} ministers to the people.

And as this necessity is great, as the practice usefull and advantageous; so is the obligation of believing and confessing particular, binding every single Christian, observable in the number and person expressed, *I believe.* As if Christ did question every one in particular, as he did him who was born blind, after he had restored him his sight, (and we are all in his condition) ^b *doest thou believe on the Son of God?* every single Christian is taught to make the same answer which he made, ^c *Lord, I believe.* As if the Son of God did promise to every one of them which are gathered

gathered together in his name, what he promised to *one of* *Math. 9. 17.*
the multitude whose son had a dumb spirit, If thou canst *23.*
believe, all things are possible to him that believeth; each
 one for himself returneth his answer, *Lord, I believe, Lord,* *24.*
help my unbelief. Not that it is unlawfull or unfit to use
 another number, and instead of I, to say, *we believe*, for ta-
 king in of others, we exclude not our selves, and addition
 of charity can be no disparagement to confession of faith.
 S. Peter answered for the twelve, *We believe, and are sure* *Joh. 6. 69.*
that thou art that Christ the son of the living God. For
 though Christ immediately replied that *one of them had*
a devil, yet is not S. Peter blam'd, who knew it not. But
 every one is taught to expresse his own faith, because by
 that he is to stand or fall; *the effectuall fervent prayer of* *Jam. 5. 16.*
a righteous man availeth much for the benefit of his bro-
 ther, but his faith availeth nothing for the justification of
 another. And it is otherwise very fit that our faith should
 be manifested by a particular confession, because it is effe-
 ctuall by particular application; therefore must it needs be
 proper for me to say, *I believe*, and to make profession
 of *my faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave* *Gal. 2. 20.*
himself for me.

Having then described the true nature and notion of
Belief, the duty of *confessing* our faith, and the obligation
 of every particular Christian to *believe* and to *confesse*,
 being in these three explications, all which can be imagi-
 nably contained in the first word of the Creed, must neces-
 sarily be included; it will now be easie for me to deliver,
 and for every particular person to understand what it
 is he sayes, and upon what ground he proceeds, when
 he begins his *Confession* with these words, *I believe*,
 which I conceive may in this manner be fitly ex-
 pressed.

Although those things which I am ready to affirm, be
 not apparent to my sense, so that I cannot say I see them;
 although they be not evident to my understanding of
 themselves,

themselves, nor appear unto me true by the virtue of any naturall and necessary cause, so that I cannot say I have any proper knowledge or science of them : yet being they are certainly contained in the Scriptures, the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets; being they were endued with miraculous power from above, & immediately inspired with the holy Ghost, & consequently what they deliver'd was not the word of man, but of God himself; being God is of that universall knowledge and infinite wisdom that it is impossible he should be deceiv'd, of that indefectible holinesse and transcendent rectitude, that it is not imaginable he should intend to deceive any man, & consequently whatsoever he hath delivered for a truth must be necessarily and infallibly true; I readily and stedfastly assent unto them as most certain truths, and am as fully and absolutely, and more concerningly perswaded of them, then of any thing I see or know. And because that God who hath revealed them, hath done it not for my benefit onely, but for the advantage of others; nor for that alone, but also for the manifestation of his own glory : being for those ends he hath commanded me to profess them, & hath promised an eternall reward upon my profession of them; being every particular person is to expect the justification of himself, and the salvation of his soul, upon the condition of his own faith; as with a certain and full perswasion I assent unto them, so with a fixed and undaunted resolution I will profess them, and with this faith in my heart, and confession in my mouth, in respect of the whole body of the Creed, and every Article and particle in it, I sincerely, readily, resolvedly say, *I believe.*

I believe

I believe IN GOD.

HAVING deliver'd the Nature of *Faith*, and the act of *belief* common to all the *Articles* of the *Creed*, that we may understand what it is to *believe*, we shall proceed to the explication of the *Articles* themselves, as the most necessary *objects* of our *Faith*, that we may know what is chiefly to be *believed*. Where immediately we meet with another word as generall as the former, and as universally concern'd in every *Article*, which is *God*: for if to *believe* be to assent upon the testimony of *God*, as we have before declar'd, then wheresoever belief is expressed or implied, there is also the name of *God* understood, upon whose testimony we *believe*. He therefore whose authority is the ground and foundation of the whole, his existence begins the *Creed* as the foundation of that authority. For if there can be no divine *Faith* without the attestation of *God*, by which alone it becomes divine, & there can be no such attestation, except there were an existence of the testifier, then must it needs be proper to begin the *Confession* of our *faith* with the agnition of our *God*. If his * name were thought fit to be express'd in the front of every action even by the heathen, because they thought no action prospered but by his approbation, much more ought we to fix it before our *Confession*, because without him to believe is no lesse then a contradiction.

* Θεός, Θεός,
 ἔδος ἢ ὄραν
 κατὰ χροιά
 πρὸς θεὸν λέ-
 γειν ἐπιση-
 μιζομένους.
 Hesych. Lex.

Now these words, *I believe in God*, will require a double consideration, one, of the phrase or manner of speech, another, of the thing or nature of the truth in that manner expressed. For to *believe* with an addition of the preposition *in* is a phrase or expression ordinarily conceived fit to be given to none but to *God* himself, as alwayes implying beside a bare act of *Faith*, an addition of hope, love, and affiance. An observation as I conceive,

peculiar to the Latine Church, grounded upon the authority of * S. *Augustine*.

finde these words. Non dicit Credo Deum, vel credo Deo, quamvis & hæc saluti necessaria sint. Aliud enim est credere illi, aliud credere illum, aliud credere in illum. Credere illi, est credere vera esse quæ loquitur, credere illum, credere quia ipse est Deus, credere in illum, diligere illum. *And though that collection of Sermons de Tempore under the name of S. Augultine be none of his, divers of them being Translations of the Greek Homilies, yet this distinction may be collected out of other parts of his works. For first he distinguisheth very clearly and seriously between credere Deo, and credere in Deum. Nunquam aliquis Apostolorum dicere auderet, qui credit in me; credimus Apostolo, sed non credimus in Apostolum. Tract. 54. in Psalm. and again, Credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum; credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum. Secondly, he distinguisheth between Credere Deum, and credere in Deum. Multum interest utrum quis credat ipsum esse Christum, & utrum eradat in Christum. Ille credit in Christum qui & sperat in Christum, & diligit Christum. De verbis Dom. Serm. 61. And which is the summe of all, he puts a high value upon the preposition, as if by virtue of the addition of in the phrase did properly signifie so great an accession unto faith. Quid est credere in Deum? credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, & ejus membris incorporari. Tract. 29. in Joh. Which doctrine of S. Austin's being taken notice of by Peter Lombard, hath since been continued by the Schoolmen; and Aquinas, Sum. 2. 2. q. 2. 2. 2. ad primum, bringing all three under one act of Faith, hath been contradicted by Durand. in 3. Sent. dis. 23. q. 7. §. 6. Credere in Deum non est præcise actus fidei, sed fidei & charitatis simul, & sunt etiam plures, & non unus actus tantum: by whose subtil but yet clear determination (as many of his are beyond the rest of the Schools) whatsoever is added by the preposition to believe, appears not to be a part of Belief, but an act superadded to the act of Faith.*

Whereas among the Greeks in whose language the New Testament was penn'd, I perceive no such distinction, and in the † Hebrew language of the Old, from which the Jewish and Christian Greeks receiv'd that phrase of *believing in*, it hath no such peculiar and accumulative signification. For it is sometimes attributed to God the author and originall cause, sometimes to the prophets the immediate revealers of the faith: sometimes it is spoken of miracles, the motives to believe, sometimes of the Law of God, the materiall object of our Faith.

† for ION is
sometimes
joyn'd with 7
sometimes with
7; when with
7, it answers
properly to
πιστευει το
θεο credere
Deo, 7 being
nothing else

but a significator of the case: when with Δ it corresponds unto πιστεύειν οὐς τὸν
 Δαδ, credere in Deum, Δ being a preposition of the same nature with οὐς or in.

Among

But yet there is so little or rather no difference in the Hebrew, that in the first place where it is used, and that of the father of the faithfull, even for the act of justifying faith, **וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱבֶדְהָם** Gen. 15. 16. it is translated by the LXX. **ἐπίστευσεν** 'Abedhah tam d'aw, not eis dady, and that translation warranted by S. Paul Ro. 4. 3. Gal. 3. 6. and S. James 2. 23. Beside, the same phrase is used in the same place both to God and to man, as Exod. 14. 31. **וַיִּשְׁמַע בְּיְהוָה וַיִּבְרָא** and they believed in God, and in his servant Moses. which the Chaldee Paraphrase explaineth thus, **וַיִּשְׁמַע בְּמִימְרָא דִּי וַיִּבְרָא מִשָּׁה**, and they believed (in) the word of God, and (in) the prophetic of Moses his servant. and 2 Chro. 20. 20. **וַיִּשְׁמַע בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וַיִּבְרָא**. Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe (in) his prophets, so shall ye prosper. For although the Vulgar Latin which our Translation followeth, hath made that distinction which the Hebrew maketh not, *Credite in Domino Deo vestro, & securi eritis; credite prophetis ejus, & cuncta evenient prospera*: yet the Septuagint acknowledgeth no necessity of receding from the originall phrase **ἐπίστευσαντες αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς προφήταις αὐτοῦ**, **ἐπίστευσαντες αὐτῷ** ἐν προφήταις αὐτοῦ, **ἐπίστευσαντες αὐτῷ**. Neither is this onely spoken of Moses and the Prophets, that the Israelites believ'd in them, but of David, not as a prophet, but as a bare relatour of his own actions. 1 Sam. 27. 12. **וַיִּשְׁמַע אַכִּישׁ בְּדָוִד**. **ἐπίστευσεν** αὐτῷ ἐν δαυὶδ. Vulg. Et credidit Achis in David. To conclude, this generall phrase of believing in, is originally attributed sometimes to the supreme authour of our faith; as to God, sometimes to the intervenient messengers, as the prophets, sometimes to the motives of our faith, Psal. 78. 32. **וַיִּשְׁמַע בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ**. LXX. **ἐπίστευσεν ἐν τοῖς θαύμασις αὐτοῦ**. and they believed not for his wondrous works. sometimes to the object of it, or that which is believed, as Psal. 119. 66. **בְּמִצְוֹתַי הֵאֱמַנְתִּי**. I have believed (in) thy Commandments.

Among all which varieties of that phrase of speech, it is sufficiently apparent, that in this Confession of faith it is most proper to admit it in the last acception; by which it is attributed to the materiall object of belief. For the Creed being nothing else but a brief comprehension of the most necessary matters of faith, whatsoever is contained in it beside the first word *I believe*, by which we make confession of our faith, can be nothing else but part of those verities to be believed, and the act of belief in respect of them nothing but an assent unto them as infallible truths. Neither can we conceive that the ancient Greek Fathers of the Church could have any further meaning in it, who make the whole body of the Creed to be of the

* S. Basil. π-
 τεύομεν ἐν ἡ
 ὁμολογούμεν
 ἕνα μόνον ἁ-
 ληθινόν καὶ ἁ-
 γαθόν θεόν
 καὶ ἕνα τὸν μο-
 νογενῆ υἱὸν
 ὃν καὶ ἐν μόν-
 ον πνεῦμα
 ἄριον.

† Arrius and
 Euzoïus in
 their Confessi-
 on delivered to
 Constantine.
 Πιστεύομεν εἰς
 ἕνα θεόν πα-
 τέρα, καὶ εἰς
 ἕνα κύριον Ἰ-
 ησοῦν, καὶ εἰς τὸ
 ἄριον πνεῦ-
 μα, καὶ εἰς

σάρκος ἀνέστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ὑψανῶν,
 καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. S. Cyril. Hierosol.
 Κατήχησις ἐν ὁμιλοῦμένων σχεδιασθεῖσα εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἄριον, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν
 καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ σάρκος ἀνέστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Eriph. in Anc. εἰς
 τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄριον, εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. and
 in a larger Confession, πτεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν,
 καὶ εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα μετανόιας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, εἰς βασιλείαν ὑψανῶν, καὶ
 ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ¶ Greg. Nyssen calls them εὐσεβεῖς καὶ θεοῦ ὑπολήψεις. and
 Eusebius in his Confession exhibited to the Council of Nice, concludes, Πιστεύομεν
 καὶ εἰς ἐν πνεῦμα ἄριον, τέσπων ἑκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πένοντες: signi-
 fying that every particular which he had rehearsed, he believed to be, and that was
 all in the Confession intended. So Tertul. de Præscript. adv. Harer. Regula est fidei
 illa qua creditur Unum omnino Deum esse, and adv. Praxeam, cap. 2. where he makes
 another rehearsal of his Creed, he begins with Unicum quidem Deum credimus.

* Maimonides de Fundam. Legis. יסוד היסודות ועמוד החכמות לומר כי יסוד כל חכמה
 נמצא כל חכמה נותן יסודו על דבר ראשון. the foundation of foundations,
 and pillar of wisdoms is to know that the first being is, and that it giveth existence
 to every thing which is.

For

† Non est amor Dei Articulus neque etiam amor proximi, quia etiam si sine præceptis generalia activa, tamen cum actio contineatur non oportet eum constituere articulum, sed ista sunt fidei dogmata quæ sunt columna & fundamenta legis divinæ. Is. Abravanel. de Cap. Fides. c. 11.

For he that cometh to God must believe that he is. And this I take for a sufficient explication of the phrase, *I believe in God*, that is, *I believe that God is*.

As for the matter or truth contained in these words so explained, it admits a threefold consideration, first, of the Notion of *God*, what is here understood by that name. Secondly, of the existence of *God*, how we know or believe that he is. Thirdly, the Unity of *God*, in that, though there be gods many and lords many, yet in our Creed we mention him as but one. When therefore we shall have clearly delivered, what is the true notion of *God* in whom we believe, how and by what means we come to assure our selves of the existence of such a Deity, and upon what grounds we apprehend him of such a transcendent nature that he can admit no competitor: then may we be conceived to have sufficiently explicated the former part of the first Article, then may every one understand what he sayes, and upon what ground he proceeds, when he professeth, *I believe in God*.

The name of *God* is attributed unto many, but here is to be understood of him who by way of eminency and excellency bears that name, and therefore is stiled a *God of gods*, the Lord our *God* is god of gods, and Lord of lords. and in the same respect is called the most high *God*, others being but inferior or under him, and *God* over or above all. And this eminency and excellency by which these titles become proper unto him and incommunicable to any other, is grounded upon the divine nature or essence, which all other who are called gods have not, and therefore are not by nature gods. d Then when ye knew not *God*, saith S. Paul, ye did service to them which by nature are not gods. There is then a *God* by nature, and others which

Heb. 11. 6.

Primus est Deorum cultus, Deos credere. Sen.

1 Cor. 8. 5.

a Deut. 10. 17.

Psalm. 136. 3.

Dan. 2. 47.

and 11. 36.

b Gen. 14. 18.

frequently.

c Rom. 9. 5.

Ephes. 4. 6.

Imprimis ne-

cesse est conce-

datis esse ali-

quem sublimi-

orem Deum &

manipem

quendam divi-

nitatis qui ex

hominibus Deos

fecerit. Tercul.

adv. Gentis.

d Gal. 4. 8.

are

* *Ego dixi, Dii estis, sed in eo indulti nominis significatio est, & ubi refertur, ego dixi, loquentis est potius sermo quam rei nomen.* S. Hilar. de Trin. l. 7.
 † *Deus plena ac perfecta divinitatis est nomen.* Hilar. de Trin. l. 11.
Deus substantia ipsius nomen, id est, divinitatis. Terul. adv. Herm.

are called Gods, but by nature are not so; for either they have no power at all, because no being, but onely in the false opinions of deceived men, as the Gods of the Heathen, or if they have any reall power or authority, from whence some are called Gods in the Scripture, yet have they it not from themselves or of their own * nature, but from him who *onely hath immortality*, and consequently onely divinity, and therefore the *onely true* 1 God. So that the Notion of a Deity doth at last expressly signifie a being or nature of infinite perfection, independent from any other, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are govern'd. 'Tis true indeed, that to give a perfect definition of God is impossible, neither can our finite reason hold any proportion with infinity: but yet a sense of this Divinity we have, and the first and common notion of it consists in these three particulars, that it is a being independent; that it is that upon which all things which are made depend; and thirdly, that it governs all things.

As for the existence of such a being, how it comes to be known unto us, or by what meanes we are assured of it, is not so unanimously agreed upon, as that it is. For although some have imagined that the knowledge of a Deity is connaturall to the soul of man, so that every man hath a connate inbred notion of a God; yet I rather conceive the soul of man to have no connaturall knowledge at all, no particular notion of any thing in it from the beginning, but to receive the first apprehensions of things by sense, and by them to make all rationall collections. If then the soul of man be at the first like a fair smooth table without any actuall characters of knowledge imprinted in it; if all the knowledge which we have comes successively by sensation, instruction, and rationall collection; then must we not referre the apprehension of a Deity to any connate notion or inbred opinion. Again, although others do affirm, that the existence of God is a truth

truth evident of it self; so as whosoever hears but these termes once named, that *God is*, cannot chuse but acknowledge it for a certain and infallible truth upon the first apprehension; that as no man can deny that the whole is greater then any part, who knoweth onely what is meant by whole, and what by part, so no man can possibly deny or doubt of the existence of God, who knows but what is meant by God, and what it is to be.

Yet can we not ground our knowledge of God's existence upon any such clear and immediate evidence: nor were it safe to lay it upon such a ground, because whosoever should deny it, could not by this means be convinced, it being a very irrationall way of instruction to tell a man that doubts of this truth, that he must believe it because 'tis evident unto him, when he knowes that he therefore onely doubts of it because it is not evident unto him.

Although therefore that *God is* be of it self an immediate, certain, necessary truth, yet must it be evidenced and made apparent unto us, by its connexion unto other truths, so that the being of the Creatour may appear unto us by his Creature, & the dependency of inferiour entities lead us to a clear acknowledgement of the supreme & independent being. The wisdom of the Jews thought this method proper; *for by the greatnesse and beauty of the creatures proportionably the maker of them is seen:* and not onely they, but S. Paul hath taught us, that *the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternall power and Godhead.* For if † *Phidias* could so contrive a piece of his own work, as in it to preserve the memory of himself never to be obliterated without the destruction of the work, well may we read the great Artificer of the world in the works of his own hands, & by the existence of any thing demonstrate the first cause of all things. We finde by the experience of our selves, that some things in this world have a beginning before which they were not;

* *Hac propositio Deus est quantum in se est, per se nota est, quia pradicatum est idem cum subiecto, Deus enim est suum esse. Sed quia nos non scimus de Deo quid est, non est nobis per se nota, sed indiget demonstrari per ea, quae sunt magis nota quoad nos, & minus nota quoad naturam, scilicet per effectus. Tho. Aquin. 1. p. q. 2. Art. 1. a Wisd. of Sol. 13. 5. b Rom. 1. 20. † in the shield of Pallas. Arist. de Munda.*

the account of the years of our age sufficiently inferre our nativities, and they our conceptions, before which we had no being. Now if there be any thing which had a beginning, there must necessarily be something which had no beginning, because nothing can be a beginning to it self. Whatsoever is, must of necessity either have been made, or not made; and something there must needs be which was never made, because all things cannot be made. For whatsoever is made, is made by another, neither can any thing produce it self, otherwise it would follow, that the same thing is and is not at the same instant in the same respect: it is, because a producer; it is not, because to be produced; it is therefore in being, and is not in being, which is a manifest contradiction. If then all things which are made were made by some other, that other which produced them, either was it self produced, or was not; and if not, then have we already an Independent being; if it were, we must at last come to something which was never made, or else admit either a circle of productions, in which the effect shall make its own cause, or an * infinite succession in causalities, by which nothing will be made, both which are equally impossible. Something then we must confesse was never made, something which never had beginning. And although these effects or dependent beings singly considered by themselves do not inferre one supreme cause and maker of them all, yet the admirable order and connexion of things shew as much, and this one supreme cause is *God*. For all things which we see or know, have their existence for some end, which no man who considereth the uses and utilities of every species can deny. Now whatsoever is and hath its being for some end, of that the end for which it is must be thought the cause, and a finall Cause is no otherwise the cause of any thing then as it moves the efficient cause to work; from whence we cannot but collect a prime efficient Cause of all things, indued with infinite wisdom, who having a full comprehension of

* Ἀλλὰ μὴν
ἐπὶ γ' ὅτιν ἀρ-
χῆς, καὶ ἐκ
πρώτης αἰτίας
τῆς οὐρανίας
οὐκ ἐκδημιώμα,
ἔτε καὶ ὁ θεός
ἐστίν. *Arist.*
Metaph. l. 2.
c. 2. and again
ἐπεὶ μὴδὲν
ἔστι τὸ πρῶ-
τον, ὅπως αἰτί-
ον ἔστιν ὅτι.
τὸ πρῶτον ἐστίν
οὐ ὅπως ἐστὶ θε-
ός; ὅτι τῆς τ'
οὐρανίας οὐκ ἐστὶ
ὡς πρὶ καὶ δια-
*μορφῆς. *Iustin.**
Quaest. & Res.
ad Græcos.

* καθόλου ὁ θεὸς
ἐν γὰρ κυβερ-
νήτῃς, ἐν ἀρ-
ματὶ ἡνίοχος,
ἐν χορῷ ὁ κο-
ρυφαῖος, ἐν
πόλει ὁ νόμος,
ἐν στρατοπέδῳ
ὁ ἡγεμὼν, τὸ το-
θεὸς ἐν κόσμῳ.
Arist. de Mun.
† Habet Domi-
nus testimoni-
um totum hoc
quod sumus, &
in quo sumus.
Tertul.

ἡ ἀρχαῖος πῆ-
λός ἐστι καὶ πᾶ-
σι τοῖς ἐν τῇ πα-
σίᾳ ἀνθρώποις,
ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ τὰ
πάντα, καὶ διὰ
θεοῦ ἡμῶν σω-
θῆναι. Arist.
de Mundo.
* Nulla gens
usquam est
adeo contra le-
ges moresque
projecta, ut non
aliquos Deos
credat. Sen.

would be the same. Were that which frames a watch within it, and all those curious wheels wrought without the hand of man, it would seem to grow into that forme, nor would there be any distinction between the making of that watch, and the growing of a plant. Now what the Artificer is to works of Art, who orders and disposes them to other ends than by nature they were made, that is the Maker of all things to all naturall agents, directing all their operations to ends which they cannot apprehend; and thus appears the Maker to be the Ruler of the world, * the steerer of this great ship, the law of this universall Commonwealth, the Generall of all the hosts of heaven and earth. By these wayes as by the † testimony of the creature, we come to finde an eternall and independent Being, upon which all things else depend, and by which all things else are governed, and this we have before supposed to be the first notion of God.

Neither is this any private collection or particular ratiocination, but the publick and universall reason of the world. || No age so distant, no countrey so remote, no people so barbarous but gives a sufficient testimony of this truth. When the Roman Eagle flew over most parts of the habitable world, they met with Atheisme no where, but rather by their miscellany Deities at Rome, which grew together with their victories, they shewed no nation was without its God. And since the later Art of Navigation improved hath discovered another part of the world, with which no former commerce hath been known, although the customes of the people be much different, and their manner of religion holds small correspondency with any in these parts of the world professed, yet in this all agree, that some religious observances they retain, and a Divinity they acknowledge. So much of the Creed hath been the generall Confession of all Nations, *I believe in God.* Which were it not a most certain truth grounded upon principles obvious unto all, what reason could we give of

of so universall a consent ? or how can it be imagined, * *Nec in hunc*
that all men should * conspire to deceive themselves and *furorē omnes*
their posterity ? *mortales con-*

Nor is the reason onely generall, and the consent unto it *senfissent allo-*
universall, but God hath still preserved and quickened the *quendi surda*
worship due unto his name, by the patefaction of himself. *numina & in-*
Things which are to come, are so beyond our knowledge, *efficaces Deos.*
Seneca.

that the wisest man can but conjecture ; and being we are assured of the contingency of future things, and our ignorance of the concurrence of severall free causes to the production of an effect, we may be sure that certain and infallible predictions are clear divine patefactions. For none but he who made all things, and gave them power to work, none but he who ruleth all things, and ordereth and directeth all their operations to their ends, none but he upon whose will the actions of all things depend, can possibly be imagined to foresee the effects depending merely on those causes. And therefore by what means we may be assured of a Prophecie, by the same we may be secured of a Divinity. Except then all the Annals of the world were forgeries, and all remarks of history designed to put a cheat upon posterity, we can have no pretence to suspect Gods existence, having so ample testimonies of his influence.

The works of nature appear by observation uniform, and there is a certain sphere of every body's power and activity. If then any action be performed which is not within the compasse of the power of any naturall agent, if any thing be wrought by the intervention of a body which beareth no proportion to it, or hath no naturall aptitude so to work, it must be ascribed to a Cause transcending all naturall causes and disposing all their operations. Thus every Miracle proves its authour, and every act of omnipotency is a sufficient demonstration of a Deity. And that man must be possessed with a strange opinion of the weaknesse of our fathers, and the testimony of all former

Psal. 44. 3.

72. 18.

ages, who shall deny that ever any Miracle was wrought. *We have heard with our eares, O God, our fathers have told us what works thou didst in their dayes, in the times of old. Blessed be the Lord God who onely doth wondrous works.*

Rom. 2. 15.

Nor are we onely informed by the necessary dependency of all things on God, as effects upon their Universal cause, or his externall paterfactions unto others, and the consentient acknowledgement of mankind; but every particular person hath a particular Remembrancer in himself, as a sufficient testimony of his Creatour, Lord, and Judge. We know there is a great force of Conscience in all men, by which their *thoughts* are ever *accusing or excusing them*, they feel a comfort in those vertuous actions which they finde themselves to have wrought according to their rule, a sting and secret remorse for all vicious acts and impious machinations. Nay those who strive most to deny a God, and to obliterate all sense of a Divinity out of their own souls, have not been least sensible of this remembrancer in their breasts. 'Tis true indeed, that a false opinion of God, and a superstitious perswasion which hath nothing of the true God in it, may breed a remorse of conscience in those who think it true; and therefore some may hence collect that the force of conscience is onely grounded upon an opinion of a Deity, and that opinion may be false. But if it be a truth, as the testimonies of the wisest writers of most different perswasions, and experience of all sorts of persons of most various inclinations do agree, that the remorse of conscience can never be obliterated, then it rather proveth then supposeth an opinion of a Divinity, and that man which most peremptorily denieth Gods existence, is the greatest Argument himself that there is a God. Let *Caligula* professe himself an Atheist, and with that profession hide his head, or run under his bed, when the thunder strikes his eares, and lightning flashes in his eyes; those terrible works of nature put him
in

in mind of the power, and his own guilt of the justice of God, whom while in his wilfull opinion he weakly denieth, in his involuntary action he strongly asserteth. So that a Deity will either be granted or extorted, and where it is not acknowledged it will be manifested. Onely unhappy is that man who denies him to himself, and proves him to others, who will not * acknowledge his existence, of whose power he cannot be ignorant. *God is not far from every one of us.* The proper discourse of S. Paul to the philosophers of Athens was, that they might seek after him and finde him. Some children have been so ungracious as to refuse to give the honour due unto their parent, but never any so irrationall as to deny they had a father. As for those who have dishonoured God, it may stand most with their interest, and therefore they may wish there were none, but cannot consist with their reason to assert there is none, when even the very Poets of the heathen have taught us that we are his off-spring.

* *Hæc est summa delicti, nolle agnoscere quem ignorare non possis. S. Cyr. de Idola Van. Act. 17. 27, 28.*

Act. 17 18.

And therefore we shall alwayes finde all nations of the world more prone unto Idolatry then to Atheisme, and readier to multiply then deny the Deity. But our Faith teacheth us equally to deny them both, and each of them are renounced in these words *I believe in God.* First, in God affirmatively, *I believe* he is, against Atheisme. Secondly in God exclusively, not in Gods, against Polytheisme and Idolatry. And that the Unity of the Godhead is included in this Article is apparent, not onely because the *Nicene* Council so expressed it by way of exposition, but also because this Creed in the Churches of the East, before the Council of *Nice* had that addition in it, *I believe in one God.* We begin our Creed then, as *Plato* did his chief and prime Epistles, who gave this distinction to his friends, that the Name of God was prefixed before those that were more serious and remarkable, but of Gods in the plurall, to such as were more vulgar and triviall. Unto thee it was shewed, saith *Moses* to *Israel*, that

† *Orientales Ecclesia omnes ista tradunt. Credo in uno Deo patre omnipotentis. Ruff. in Symb. ¶ Eu. in præp. Evang. the passage is yet extant in the Epistles of Plato. Deut. 4. 35.*

thou

1 Cor. 8. 4.

thou mightest know that the Lord he is God, there is none else beside him. & as the Law so the Gospel teacheth us the same, we know that an Idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. This Unity of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence, so that it must be as impossible there should be more Gods then one, as that there should be none: which will clearly be demonstrated, first out of the Nature of God, to which multiplication is repugnant; and secondly from the Government as he is Lord, in which we must not admit Confusion.

Isa. 48. 12.

44. 6.

For first the nature of God consists in this, that he is the prime and originall cause of all things, as an independent being upon which all things else depend, and likewise the ultimate end or finall cause of all; but in this sense two prime causes are inimaginable, & for all things to depend of one, and to be more independent beings then one, is a clear contradiction. This primity God requires to be attributed to himself, *Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called. I am he, I am the first, I also am the last.* And from this primity he challengeth his Unity; *Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.*

Again if there were more Gods then one, then were not all perfections in one, neither formally, by reason of their distinction, nor eminently, and virtually, for then one should have power to produce the other, and that nature which is producible is not divine. But all acknowledge God to be absolutely and infinitely perfect, in whom all perfections imaginable which are simply such must be contained formally, and all others which imply any mixture of imperfection, virtually.

But were no arguments, brought from the infinite perfections of the divine nature, able to convince us, yet were the consideration of his supreme Dominion sufficient to perswade

perswade us. The will of God is infinitely free, and by that freedome doth he govern and dispose of all things, *He doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth*, said *Nebuchadnezzar* *Dan. 4. 35.* out of his experience; and *S. Paul* expresseth him as *working all things after the counsel of his own will*. If then there were more supreme governours of the world then one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, then which nothing can be more prejudicial unto government. God is a God of order, not confusion, and therefore of unity, not admitting multiplication. If it be better that the * Universe should be governed by one then many, we may be assured that it is so, because nothing must be conceived of God, but what is best. He therefore who made all things, by that right is Lord of all, and because all † power is his, he alone ruleth over all.

Without this acknowledgement Religion cannot subsist, it being part of the worship and honour due unto God, to accept of no compartner with him. When the Law was given, in the observance whereof the Religion of the Israelites consisted, the first precept was this prohibition, *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me*, and whosoever violateth this, denieth the foundation on which all the rest depend, as the † Jews observe.

This is the true reason of that strict precept by which all are commanded to give divine worship to God onely. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve*; because he alone is God: him onely shalt thou fear, because he alone hath infinite power; in him onely shalt thou trust, because he onely is our rock and our salvation; to him alone shalt thou direct thy devotions, because he onely knoweth the hearts of the children of men. Upon this foundation the whole heart of man is intirely required of him and engaged to him. *Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one God: And (or rather therefore) thou shalt love*

* τὸ ὅλον ἢ ἐν-
λεται πολλῶν
ἐξ κακῶν: ὅτι
ἀγαθὸν πολυ-
κειραν, ὅτι
καὶ ἐν ὅ. *A-*
rist. Metaph.
l. 12. c. ult.

† unus omnium
Dominus est
Deus: neq; enim
illa sublimitas
potest habere
confortem, cum
sola omnem te-
neat potesta-
tem. S. Cypr.
de Idol. Vanit.
Exod. 10. 3.
‡ *Moses Mai-*
mon, de Fund.
legis. c. 3.

Math. 4. 10.

Psal. 62. 2.

2 Chron. 6. 30.

Deut. 6. 4. 5.

* Numerus divinitatis summa ratione constare deberet, vel quoniam & cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur. Ecce e. duos inveniunt Deos tam pares quam duo summa magna; quid facerem si ambos colerem? dantia officii superstitio potius

quam religio crederetur. quia duos tam pares & in altero ambos possem in uno demereri. hoc ipso testimonium præstans parilitati & unitati eorum, dum alterum in altero veneraret, dum in uno mihi duo sunt. Tertul. adv. Marcion. l. i. c. 5. *Matth. 6. 24.*
 † When Leo Bishop of Rome in an Epistle to Flavianus had written these words, Fidelium universitas profiteretur credere se in Deum patrem omnipotentem, & in Jesum Christum filium ejus, One of the Eutychians objected with this Question, Cur non dixerit in unum Deum patrem, & in unum Jesum. juxta Nicæni Decretum Concilii? to which Vigilius Bishop of Trent gives this answer, Sed Romæ & antequam Nicæna Synodus conveniret à temporibus Apostolorum usque ad nunc ita fidelibus Symbolum traditur, nec præjudicant verba ubi sensus incolumis permanet: magis enim cum D. J. Christi sententia hæc fidei professio facit dicentis, *Creditis in Deum, & in me credite*, nec dixit in unum Deum patrem, & in unum meipsum. Quis enim nesciat unum esse Deum & unum J. Christum filium ejus? *Vigil. l. 4. con. Eutych.*
 † Rab. Chasdaï in Or Adonai. R. Joseph Albo in Hikkarim.

Now God is not onely *One*, but hath an *Unity* † peculiar to himself; by which he is the *Onely* God; and that not onely by way of actuality, but also of possibility. Every Individuall man is one, but so as there is a second and a third, and consequently every one is part of a number, and concurring to a multitude. The Sun indeed is one; שנים אלה אחד שאין כיוצאיה אחד מן האחרים הנמצאים בעולם לא

אחד במין שהוא כולל אחרים הרבה : ולא אחד בגוף שהוא נחלק
למחלקות וקצוות אלא אחד שאין ייחוד אחד כמוהו בעולם :

God is one, not two, or more then two, but onely One ; whose Unity is not like to that of the Individualls of this world, neither is he one by way of Species comprehending many individualls, neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes : but he is so one, as no unity like his is to be found in the world. Moses Maim. de Fundam. Legis.

Quod autem diximus Orientis Ecclesias tradere unum Patrem Omnipotentem, & unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed universalitate : verbi gratia, si quis dicat unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit, potest enim & alius homo esse, & tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus & tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri sed universalitatis est nomen. Ut si exempli causa dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur ut alius vel tertius addi non possit ; multo magis Deus cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri sed universalitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est qui propterea unus dicatur, quod alius non sit. *Ruffi. in Symb.*

so as there is neither third nor second sun : but though there be not, yet there might have been ; neither in the unity of the solar nature is there any repugnancy to plurality ; for that God which made this world, and in this, *the Sun to rule the day*, might have made another world by the same fecundity of his omnipotency, and another sun to rule in that. Whereas in the Divine nature there is an intrinsecall and essentiall singularity, because no other Being can have any existence but from that, and whatsoever Essence hath its existence from another, is not God. *I am the Lord*, saith he, *and there is none else, there is no God besides me : that they may know from the rising of the Sun,* *Deut. 4. 35.* *and from the West, that there is none besides me ; I am the Lord, and there is none else.* He who hath infinite knowledge knoweth no other God beside himself. *Is there a God besides me ? yea there is no God. I know not any.* And we who believe in him, and desire to enjoy him, need for that end to know no other God but him, *for this is life eternall, that they might know thee the onely true God :* *John 17. 3.* * as certainly *one* as God. * Veritas Christiana distincte pronun-

ciavit, Deus si non unus est non est : quia dignius credimus non esse, quodcunque non ita fuerit ut esse debeat : *Tertul. adv. Marcion, l. i. c. 2.* Deus cum summum

magnum sit, recte veritas nostra pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est, non est. Non quasi dubitemus esse Deum, dicent si non unus, non est Deus; sed quia quem confidimus esse, idem definiamus esse, quod si non est Deus, non est, summum scilicet magnum. Porro summum magnum unicum sit necesse est, ergo & Deus unicus erit non aliter Deus, nisi summum magnum, nec aliter summum magnum nisi patrem non habens, nec aliter patrem non habens nisi unicus fuerit. *ibid.*

Having thus described the first *Notion* of a *God*, having demonstrated the *Existence* and *Unity* of that *God*, and having in these three particulars comprised all which can be contained in this part of the Article, we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he sayes when he makes his *Confession* in these words, *I believe in God*, which in correspondence with the precedent discourse may be thus expressed :

Forasmuch, as by all things created is made known the *eternall power and Godhead*, and the dependency of all limited beings inferre an infinite and independent essence; whereas all things are for some end, and all their operations directed to it, although they cannot apprehend that end for which they are, and in prosecution of which they work, and therefore must be guided by some universall and overruling wisdom; being this collection is so evident, that all the Nations of the earth have made it, being God hath not onely written himself in the lively characters of his creatures, but hath also made frequent patefactions of his Deity, by most infallible predictions, and supernaturall operations; therefore I fully assent unto, freely acknowledge, and clearly professe this truth, that *there is a God*.

Again, being a prime and independent Being supposeth all other to depend, and consequently no other to be God, being the intire fountain of all perfections is incapable of a double head, and the most perfect government of the Universe speaks the supreme dominion of one absolute Lord; hence do I acknowledge that God to be but one, and in this Unity or rather singularity of the Godhead, excluding
all

all actuall or possible multiplication of a Deity, *I believe in God.*

I believe in God the FATHER.

After the Confession of a *Deity*, and assertion of the Divine *Unitie*, the next Consideration is concerning Gods *Paternity*; for that *one God is Father of all*, and *to us there is but one God, the Father.* Eph. 4. 6.
1 Cor. 8. 6.

Now, although the Christian notion of the divine *Paternity* be some way peculiar to the Evangelicall patefaction, yet * wheresoever *God* hath been acknowledged, he hath been understood and worshipped as a *Father*: the very heathen † Poets so describe their Gods, and their vulgar names did carry *father* || in them, as the most popular and universall notion.

tum honoris gratia, sed & rationis: & quod antiquior est homine, & quod vitam, salutem, victum præstat ut pater. Itaque & Jupiter à precantibus Pater vocatur; & Saturnus, & Janus, & Liber, & cæteri deinceps: *Lactan. de ver. Sap. l. 4. c. 3.* † That so frequent in Homer, *πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*, eundemque appellans dicit *Ennius*, Divumque hominumque pater rex: *Varr. de L. L. l. 4. as* *Servius* observes of *Virgil*, à Poeta pene omnibus Diis nomen paternum additur, ut fiant venerabiliore: and before him *Lucilius*. Ut nemo sit nostrum quin pater optimus Divum. Ut *Neptunus* pater, *Liber*, *Saturnus* pater, *Mars*, *Janus*, *Quirinus* pater nomen dicatur ad unum. *Lactan. ib.* || as *Jupiter*, which is *Jovis* pater, or *Ζεύς*, otherwise *Diespiter*, or *Διὸς Πάτερ*, and *Marspiter*, of whom *Servius*, apud Pontifices *Marspiter* dicitur: *Æne. l. 3.* So *Semipater* for *Semo*, and *Ζαρδανάπτερ* for *Sardus* the proper Deity of *Sardinia*: *Ptolem.*

This name of *Father* is a Relative, and the proper foundation of *Paternity*, as of a Relation, is Generation. As therefore the phrase of generating is diversely attributed unto severall acts, of the same nature with Generation properly taken, or by consequence attending on it: so the Title of *Father* is given unto divers persons or things, and for severall reasons unto the same God.

These are the Generations of the heavens and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made Gen. 2. 4.

the heavens and the earth, saith Moses. So that the Creation or production of any thing by which it is, and before was not, is a kind of generation, and consequently the Creator or Producer of it a kinde of Father. Hath the rain

Job 38. 28.

* ἐπεὶ οὗτος γὰρ
πῶς ὑμεῖς πατέρα
θεοῦ ἀκούετε,
καὶ ἐπεὶ οὗτος ὁ
Severus in Job.
† Plutarch of
Plato calling
God πατέρα
πάντων καὶ
ποιητὴν, says,
τῷ μετὰ πορῶ
ῥεῶντι θεῷ,
ὡς ὅτι ἐὼθε, ὁ
αἰπὸν πατέρα
τοῦ κόσμου καί
κληκε. Platon.
Quæst. & Alci-
mus, πατὴρ δὲ
θεοῦ καὶ αἰπὸς
ἐστὶ πάντων.

21 Cor. 8. 6.
|| So Plutarch
answers the
Question, why
Plato termes
God the Maker
and Father of
all things. * H

ὅτι μὲν θεῶν
ὅτι γεννητῶν καὶ
ὅτι ἀνθρώπων
πατὴρ θεοῦ
ποιητὴς ὁ θεὸς
ἀλόγων καὶ ἀ-

λόγων; Father of Gods and men, Maker of things inanimate and irrationall. &
ὁ χρυσὸς φησὶ Χρύσιππος πατέρα καλεῖσθαι τὸν ἀγαθόντα τὸ πᾶν καὶ ὡς
ἐκ τοῦ πᾶντος γεννᾷται. Non enim agri pater, si Chrysippo credimus, is dicitur
qui cum concepit, quanquam ἐκ σπέρματος deinde fruges nascantur : as the Latine

a Father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew? by which
words Job signifies, that as there is no other cause assigne-
able of the rain but God, so may he as the cause be called
the Father of it, though not in the most proper sense, * as
he is the Father of his Son : and so the Philosophers of
old, who thought that God did make the world, called
him expressly, as the Maker, so the Father of it. and
thus *to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are*
all things ; to which the words following in the Creed
may seem to have relation, *the Father Almighty, maker*
of heaven and earth. But in this Masse of Creatures and
body of the Universe, some works of the Creation more
properly call Him Father, as being more rightly sons, such
are all the rationall and intellectuall offspring of the Deity.
Of merely naturall beings, and irrationall agents he is the
Creator, of rationall, as so, the Father also ; they are his
creatures, these his sons. Hence he is stiled the *b Father of*
Spirits, and the blessed Angels, when he laid the foun-
dations of the earth, his sons, *c When the morning starres*
sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy ; hence
Man whom he created after his own image, is called his
offspring, and *Adam* the immediate work of his hands,
the son of God ; hence may we all cry out with the Israe-
lites taught by the Prophet so to speak, *f Have we not all*
one Father? hath not one God created us? Thus the first
and most universal notion of Gods Paternity in a borrow-
ed or Metaphoricall sense is founded rather upon Crea-
tion then procreation.

Again

Translation most absurdly : for there is neither corn nor field nor any seed belonging to them in the words of Plutarch. But Χόειον (not Χωελον) is the Secunda, the coat (or rather coats in the acception of Chrysippus, and the language of those times) in which the fœtus is involved in the mothers wombe. Though therefore both the Secunda and the Fœtus be made of the seed of the male in the Philosophy of Chrysippus, yet he is not called the father of the after-birth but of the child, the one being endued with life and reason, and the other not. b Heb. 12. 9. c Job 38. 7. d Acts 17. 29. e Luke 3. 37. f Malach. 2. 10.

Again, Redemption from a state of misery, by which a people hath become worse then nothing, unto a happy condition, is a kind of *Generation*, which joynd with love, care, and indulgence in the Redeemer, is sufficient to found a new *Paternity*, and give him another title of a *Father*. Well might *Moses* tell the people of Israel, now brought out of the land of *Egypt* from their brick and straw, unto their quails and manna, unto their milk and hony, *Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee, and established thee?* Well might God speak unto the same people as to his son even his first-born, *Exod. 4. 22.* Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the wombe, *Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the wombe. Isa. 44. 24. 46. 3.* And just is the acknowledgement made by that people instructed by the Prophet, *Doubtlesse thou art our father though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not; thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer from everlasting is thy name.* And thus another kinde of paternall Relation of God unto the sons of men is founded on a Restitution or temporall Redemption. *Isa. 63. 16.*

Besides, if to be born causeth a Relation to a Father, then to be born again maketh an addition of another : and if to generate foundeth, then to regenerate addeth a *Paternity*. Now though we cannot enter the second time into our mothers wombe, nor passe through the same doore into the Scene of life again; yet we believe and are perswaded

- Joh. 3. 3.* ded that *except a man be born again, he cannot see the*
Totum homi- *kingdome of God.* A double birth there is, and the "world
num genus quo- *consists of two, the first and the second man.* And though
dammodo sunt *the incorruptible seed be the word of God, and the dispen-*
homines duo, *sers of it in some sense may say, as S. Paul spake unto the*
primus & se- *Corinthians, I have begotten you through the Gospel: yet*
cundus. Prosp. *he is the true father, whose word it is, and that is God,*
I Cor. 4. 15. *even the Father of lights, who of his own will be-*
James 1. 18. *gat us with the word of truth.* Thus *whosoever belie-*
I John 5. 1. *vesth that Jesus is Christ, is born of God: which regene-*
Ephes. 2. 10. *ration is as it were a second creation, for we are Gods*
workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.
And he alone who did create us out of nothing, can beget
us again, and make us of the new creation. When *Rachel*
Gen. 30. 1. 2. *called to Jacob, give me children or else I die; he answer-*
† εἰς ἀπὸ θεοῦ *ed her sufficiently with this question, Am I in Gods stead?*
ἐργασίμῃ; *And if he onely openeth the wombe, who else can make*
μόνη δυνάμει *the † soul to bear? Hence hath he the name of Father, and*
τὰς ψυχὰς *they of sons, who are born of him; and so from that in-*
μήδ' αὖτις γ- *ternall act of spirituall regeneration another title of Pa-*
νῶσαι, καὶ αὖτις *ternity redoundeth unto the Divinity.*
γενεῖν αὖ αὐτῆς *Nor is this the onely second birth, or sole Regeneration*
ἀρετῆς, καὶ ποι- *in a Christian sense; the soul which after its naturall being*
οῦν ἐγκύμοναι *requires a birth into the life of grace, is also after that born*
καὶ πικτίσασθαι *again into a life of glory. Our Saviour puts us in mind of*
καλῶ. Philo *the Regeneration, when the son of man shall sit in the*
de Allego. *throne of his glory.* The Resurrection of our bodies is a
Matth. 19. 28. *kind of coming out of the womb of the earth, and en-*
Luc. 20. 35, 36. *tring upon immortality, a nativity into another life. For*
Rom. 8. 17. *they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world,*
Col. 3. 24. *and the resurrection from the dead, are the sons of God, be-*
Heb. 9. 15. *ing the Sons of the Resurrection, and then as sons, they*
3 Joh. 3. 2. *become heirs, coheirs with Christ, receiving the promise*
καὶ ἔτι οὐ φανε- *and reward of eternall inheritance. Beloved, now we are*
ρῶσθαι. *the sons of God, saith S. John, even in this life by regene-*
ration, and it doth not yet appear, or, it hath not been yet
made

made manifest, what we shall be ; but we know, that if he appear, we shall be like him : the manifestation of the Father being a sufficient declaration of the condition of the Sons, when the Sonship it self consisteth in a similitude of the Father. And Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, To an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us. Why may not then a second kind of Regeneration, be thought a fit addition of this paternall relation ?

1 Pet. I. 3, 4.

Neither is there onely a naturall, but also a voluntary and civil foundation of Paternity: for the Laws have found a way by which a man may become a father without procreation. and this imitation of nature is called Adoption, taken in the generall signification. Although therefore many wayes God be a father, yet least any way might seem to exclude us from being his sons, he hath made us so also by adoption. Others are wont to fly to this, as to a comfort of their solitary condition, when either nature hath denied them, or death bereft them of their offspring. Whereas God doth it not for his own, but for our sakes; nor is the advantage his but ours.

* Cai. Inst. a.

r. 5. S. 1.

Adoptio na-

tura simili-

tudo est, ut

aliquis filium

habere possit,

quem non gene-

ravit. τι δὲν

υιοθεσία ; νο-

μίμησιν ὡς υἱο-

μίμησιν

την φύσιν ὡς παῖδων παρὰ φύσιν ὁμιλονομίαν ; Theoph. Inst. I. c. 11.

† Ἡ υιοθεσία Ρωμαικῇ φωνῇ λέγεται ἀδοπίων· αὐτὴ ἔστι ψυχικὸν ὄνομα οἷς δὲν διαγίνεται, οἷς ἀδρόγαπὼν, καὶ τὴν ὁμώνυμον ἀδοπίων. Theoph. ibid.

* Cai. Inst. . Tit. 5. S. 4. Spadones autem qui generare non possunt, adoptare possunt, & licet filios generare non possint, quos adoptaverunt filios habere possunt. Ulp. ut. S. 6. Hi qui generare non possunt, velut spado, utroque modo possunt adoptare. Idem juris est in calibe. Theoph. ibid. 11.

τις γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει τις παῖδας διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔλθῃν ἐπὶ γάμῳ, ἢ ἔλθῃν μὲν, μὴ παιδοποιῆσαι δὲ, ἢ παιδοποιῆσαι μὲν, ἀποβάλλεσθαι δὲ τέκνον, τὸ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ἐκείνου. ἢ τὸ συμβῆναι δυσ-

χρημα βλάβῳ. ὁππότε οὖν ἔλαβεν οἷς υιοθεσίαν πρὸς Leonis Novel. 27.

τοῖς ἀτυχέσι ἀπαιδῶν λύσιν βλάβῳ. τὸ δυσχρημα νόμος υιοθετεῖται πρὸς τὰς αἰτίας, καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνο κληθεῖς, ὃ μὴ ὑποστῇ λαθεῖν πρὸς τῆς φύσεως.

ἡ γὰρ υιοθεσία ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκείνου κληθεῖς, ὃ μὴ ὑποστῇ λαθεῖν πρὸς τῆς φύσεως.

G

Behold

1 John 3. 1.

2 Eph. 3. 15.

* In alienam familiam transi-
tus, is the de-
scription in A-
ge. lius 1. 5. 19.

Cum in alie-
nam familiam
inq; liberorum
locum extranei
sumuntur, aut
per prætorem
fit, aut per po-
pulum. quod
per prætorem
fit, adoptio di-
citur; quod per
populum, adop-
tio. ib.

b Eph. 1. 18.

† As appears out of the Form of Rogation yet extant in this manner. Velitis, jubeatis, Quirites, uti Lucium Valerium Lucio Titio tam jure legeque Filius ubi fiet, quam si ex eo patre matreque familia ejus natus esset, utique ei viræ necisque in eo potestas fiet, uti patri endo filio est? ib. c Eph. 1. 5. d Rom. 8. 15.

Eph. 6. 1, 2

Malach. 1. 6.

Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God. that we the sons of disobedient and condemned Adam by naturall generation, should be translated into the glorious liberty of the sons of God by adoption: that we who were aliens, strangers and enemies, should be assumed unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, on whom all the * family of heaven and earth is named, and be made partakers of b the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the Saints. For as in the legall adoption, the Father hath as † full and absolute power over his adopted son, as over his own issue: so in the spirituall, the adopted sons have a clear and undoubted right of inheritance. He then who hath c predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, hath thereby another kind of paternall relation; and so we receive the d Spirit of adoption, whereby we crye Abba Father.

The necessity of this faith in God as in our Father appeareth, first in that it is the ground of all our filiall fear, honour, & obedience due unto him upon this relation. Honour thy Father is the first Commandment with promise, written in tables of stone with the finger of God: & Children obey your parents in the Lord, is an Evangelicall precept, but founded upon principles of reason and justice; for this is right, saith S. Paul. And if there be such a rationall and legall obligation of honour and obedience to the fathers of our flesh, how much more must we think our selves obliged to him whom we believe to be our heavenly and everlasting Father? A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear, saith the Lord.

Lord of hosts? If we be heirs, we must be coheirs with Christ; if sons, we must be brethren to the onely begotten: but being he came not to do his own will, but the will of him that sent him, he acknowledgeth no fraternity but with such as do the same, as he hath said; *Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother.* If it be required of a Bishop in the Church of God; to be *one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;* what obedience must be due, what subjection must be paid unto the father of the family?

Maub. 2.50.

1 Tim. 3.4.

The same Relation in the object of our faith is the life of our devotions, the expectation of all our petitions. Christ, who taught his disciples, and us in them, how to pray, propounded not the knowledge of God, though without that he could not hear us; neither represented he his power, though without that he cannot help us: but comprehended all in this Relation, *when ye pray, say, Our Father.* This prevents all vain repetitions of our most earnest desires, and gives us full security to cut off all tautology; for *our Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him.* This creates a clear assurance of a grant without mistake of our petitions: *What man is there of us, who if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? or if he ask fish, will give him a serpent? If we then who are evil know how to give good gifts unto our children, how much more shall our Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?*

Mat. 7. 8, 9, 10.

Mat. 7. 8, 9, 10.
 adti nupus
 exagnot. me-
 oipula imi of
 tu xaleu aiqu
 uhyay adti of
 Sexibow.

Zenob.

Again, this paternity is the proper foundation of our Christian patience, sweetning all afflictions with the name and nature of fatherly corrections. *We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and love?* especially considering that they chastened us *after their own pleasure;* but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness: they, as an argument of

Od' adti mwg
 exagnot. me-
 pat. Lycophron.
 Heb. 12. 9, 10.
 Quod si a Do-
 mino nonnul-
 la credimus in-
 cori, cui magis
 patentiam
 quam Domino

præbeamus?

Quin insuper
graculâri &
gaudere nos
docet dignati-
one divinæ ca-
stigationis. E-
go, inquir, quos
diligis, castigo.

O servum il-
lum beatum,
cujus emenda-
tioni Demi-
nus instat, cui
dignatur irasci,
quæ admonen-
di dissimulatio-
ne non decipit.
Tertul. de Pat.
a Deut. 8. 5.
b Psal. 103. 13.

their authority, He, as an assurance of his love: they, that we might acknowledge them to be our parents, He, that he may persuade us that we are his sons. *For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he re- ceiveth.* And what greater incitement unto the exercise of patience is imaginable unto a suffering soul, then to see in every stroke the hand of a father, in every affliction a demonstration of his love? Or how canst thou repine, or be guilty of the least degree of impatiency even in the sharpest corrections, *a if thou shalt know with thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee?* How canst thou not be comforted, and even rejoyce in the midst of thy greatest sufferings, when thou knowest that he which striketh pitieth, he which afflicteth is as it were afflicted with it? *b for like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.*

Lastly, the same Relation strongly inferreth an absolute necessity of our imitation; it being clearly vain to assume the title of son, without any similitude of the father.

* πατὴρ γεννῶν
ὁμοίον ἑαυτοῦ
ἑνός. Epiph.
Har. 76. 6.

† τὸ εἶμα
ἡμῶν αἰς
γεννησθῆναι τὰ
ἐκ γονα εὐλο-
γῶν. Arist. de
Gen. Animal.
Lib. 1. c. 19.

¶ Fortes crean-
tur fortibus &
bonis. Est in
juvencis, est in
equis patrum Virtus, nec imbellem feroces
Progenerant aquilæ columbam. Horat.
Od. c. Gen. 5. 3. & Ephes. 5. 1. *μυσταί.* Filii hominum sunt quando male faciunt,
quando bene, filii Dei. 3. Aug. in Psal. 52.

What is the generall notion of Generation but the production of the like; nature ambitious of perpetuity, striving to preserve the species in the multiplication and succession of individuals? And this similitude consisteth partly in essentials, or the likenesse of nature; partly in accidentals, or the likenesse in figure or affections. *c Adam begat a son in his own likenesse, after his image.* and can we imagine those the sons of God, which are no way like him? A similitude of nature we must not, of figure we cannot pretend unto; it remains then onely that we bear some likenesse in our actions and affections. *d Be ye therefore followers,* saith the Apostle, or rather imitators, *of God, as dear children.* What he hath revealed of himself, that we must expresse within our selves. Thus God spake unto the

chil-

children of Israel, whom he filed his son, *a Ye shall be holy, for I am holy.* And the Apostle upon the same ground speaketh unto us, as to obedient children, *b As he that hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation.* It is part of the generall beneficence and universall goodnesse of our God, that *c he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.* These impartial beams and undistinguishing showers are but to shew us what we ought to do, and to make us fruitfull in the works of God; for no other reason Christ hath given us this command, *Love your enemies, blesse them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, that ye may be the children of your father which is in heaven.* No other command did he give upon this ground, but, *d Be ye therefore mercifull as your Father is mercifull.*

So necessary is this faith in God as in *our Father*, both for direction to the best of actions, and for consolation in the worst of conditions.

But although this be very necessary, yet is it not the principall or most proper explication of Gods Paternity. for as we find one person in a more peculiar manner the Son of God; so must we look upon God as in a more peculiar manner the Father of that Son. *e I ascend unto my father, and your father,* saith our Saviour; the same of both, but in a different manner, denoted by the Article prefixed before the one and not the other: which distinction in the originall we may preserve by this translation, *I ascend unto the father of me, and father of you;* first of me, and then of you: not therefore his, because ours, but therefore ours, because his. So farre we are the sons of God, as we would have seemed first ours, then Christs. but being prefixed to *πατήρα μου*, it shews God to be principally and originally Christs, and by our reference unto him, our father. *πάτερ μου μὲν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ θεότητι, καὶ πάτερ υἱοῦ διὰ χάριν ἐν τῇ υἰοθεσίᾳ.* Epiphani. Hæret. 69. §. 55. *ἐκ οὐκ ὁν πρὸς τὸν πάτέρα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ὄν καὶ οὐκ ὁν πρὸς τὸν τὸ δικαίον, πρὸς τὸν πάτέρα μου, ὅθεν ἦν καὶ αὐτὸν ὄν. ἐπαπαρχῶν καὶ πάτερ υἱοῦ, ὅπου ἦν καὶ αὐτὸν.* S. Cyril. Catech. 7.

a Lev. 11. 44. and 19 2. and 20. 7. b 1 Pet. 1. 15.

c Mat. 5. 44, 45 vide S. Aug. in Psalm. 100.

d Luke 6. 36.

Similitudinem patris adus indicent sobolis: similitudo operis similitudinem indicet generis: adus nomen confermet, ut non engenui demor-

Ret. Aug. 16 Temp. Ser. 76.

e Joh. 20. 17. ἀναβαίτω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πάτερ υἱοῦ. Had πατέρα in both places had its article. there would have seemed two fathers: had the article been prefixed to πατέρα υἱοῦ, he

Rom. 8. 29.

Heb. 1. 2.

Gal. 4. 4, 5, 6.
Hoc facit Deus
ex filiis homi-
num filios Dei,
quia ex filio
Dei fecit Deus
filium homi-
nis. 8. Aug. in
Psal. 52.

a Galat. 4. 7.

b Heb. 1. 11.

* Dicimur &
filii Dei, sed
ille aliter filius
Dei. 8. Aug. in
Psal. 88. 85
τοῖς υἱοῖς
πολλῶν μὲν
κατὰ χριστικῶς
οικτιρῆς, ἐν δὲ ᾧ
μὲν οὖρον 2
ἀληθὲς καὶ
μονογενὲς υἱός.
S. Cyril Hieros.
Catech. 7.

c Heb. 2. 10.

d Isa. 8. 18.

Heb. 2. 13.

e Gal. 3. 26.

f John 1. 12.

¶ Ergo nemo
in filiis Dei si-
milis erit filio
Dei. Et ipse di-
ctus est filius

Dei, & nos dicti sumus filii Dei: Sed quis erit similis Domino in filiis Dei? Ille
unicus, nos multi. Ille unus, nos in illo unum. Ille natus, nos adoptati: Ille ab æ-
terno filius unigenitus per naturam, nos à tempore facti per gratiam. 8. Aug. Psal. 88.

ration,

are like unto him; and our similitude unto God consisteth in our conformity to the likenesse of his Son. *For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren.* He the first-born, and we sons, as brethren unto him: he appointed heir of all things, and we heirs of God, as joynt heirs with him. Thus God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of Sons. And because we are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, *Abba Father.* By his mission are we adopted, and by his Spirit call we God our Father. So are we no longer a servants, but now Sons; and if Sons, then heirs of God, but still through Christ. 'Tis true indeed, b that both he that sanctifieth, that is Christ, and they who are sanctified, that is faithfull Christians, are all of one, the same father, the same God; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren: yet are they * not all of him after the same manner, not the c many Sons like the Captain of their salvation. But Christ the beloved, the first-born, the only begotten, the Son after a more peculiar and more excellent manner; the rest with relation unto, and dependance on his Sonship, as given unto him; d *Behold I and the children which God hath given me;* as being so by faith in him. e *For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,* as receiving the right of sonship from him. f *For as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.* ¶ Among all the sons of God there is none like to that one Son of God: and if there be so great a disparitie in the filiation, we must make as great a difference in the correspondent relation. There is one degree of sonship founded on Creation, and that is the lowest, as belonging unto all, both good and bad: another degree above that there is grounded upon Regene-

ration, or Adoption, belonging only to the truly faithfull in this life : and a third above the rest founded on the Resurrection, or Collation of the eternal inheritance, and the Similitude of God, appertaining to the Saints alone in the world to come. For *we are now the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be ; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him.* And there is yet another degree of filiation, of a greater eminency and a different nature, appertaining properly to none of these, but to the true Son of God alone, who amongst all his brethren hath only received the title of his * own Son, and a singular testimony from heaven, *a This is my beloved Son*, even in the presence of *John* the Baptist, even in the midst of *Moses* and *Elias*, (who are certainly the sons of God by all the other three degrees of filiation ;) and therefore hath called God after a peculiar way *b his own father*. And so at last we come unto the most singular and eminent paternal relation, *c unto the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore ;* the Father of him and of us, but not the Father of us as *†* of him. Christ hath taught us to say, *Our Father* : a *forme* of speech which he never used himself. Sometimes he calls him *the Father*, sometimes *my Father*, sometimes *your*, but never *our* ; he makes no such conjunction of us to himself, as to make no distinction between us and himself. So conjoyning us as to distinguish, though so distinguishing as not to separate us.

1 John 3. 2.

* *Rom. 8. 32.*

Uc magnificentia Dei dilectionis ex comparationis genere noscitur, non peperisse Patrem proprio filio suo docuit. Nec utique pro adoptandis adoptato, neque pro creatis creaturæ : sed pro alienis suo, pro communcupandis proprio.

Hilar. l. 6. de Trin.

a Mat. 3. 17.

and 17. 5.

Anne tibi in eo quod dicitur,

Hic est, non hoc significare videtur : alios quidem cognominatos ab eo filios, sed hic filius meus est. Donavi adoptionis plurimis nomen ; sed iste mihi filius est ? *id. b Joh. 5. 18. πατὴρ ἰδίου λέγει τὸν Θεόν, as Rom. 8. 32. ὁ γὰρ τὸν ἰδίον υἱὸν ἔκρινεν. c. 2 Cor. 11. 31. † Non sicut Christi pater, ita & nostri pater. Nunquam enim Christus ita nos conjunxit, ut nullam distinctionem faceret inter nos & se. Ille enim filius æqualis patri, ille æternus cum patre, patrique coæternus. Nos autem facti per filium, adoptati per unicum. Proinde nunquam auditum est de ore Domini nostri Jesu Christi, cum ad discipulos loqueretur, dixisse illum de Deo summo patre suo, Pater noster ; sed aut Pater meus dixit, aut Pater vester, usque adeo ut quodam loco poneret hæc duo ; *Vado ad Deum meum*, inquit, & Deum*

indeed.

vestrum. Quare non dixit Deum nostrum? & patrem meum dixit, & patrem vestrum, non dixit nostrum. Sic jungit ne distinguat, sic distinguit ut non sejungat. Unum nos vult esse in se, unum autem patrem & se. S. August. in Joan. Tract. 21.

Indeed I conceive this, as the most eminent notion of Gods Paternity, so to be the originall and proper explanation of this Article of the Creed: and that not only because the Ancient Fathers deliver no other exposition of it; but also because that which I conceive to be the first occasion, rise, and original of the Creed it self, requireth this as the proper interpretation. Immediately before the ascension of our Saviour, he said unto his Apostles, *All*

Mat. 28. 18, 19.

* Arius and Euzoius, in their Creed delivered to Constantine:

Ταύτην τὴν πίστιν παρελήφαμεν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ εὐαγγελίῳ, λέγοντες τὸ κλεινὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, πορευόμενοι μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βα-

πτίζοντες αὐτοὺς ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Socrat. l. 1. c. 26. And upon the exhibiting this Confession of faith, they were restored to the Communion of the Church by the Synod of Jerusalem. Sozom. l. 2. c. 27. In the same manner Eusebius delivered his Creed unto the Council of Nice, concluding and deducing it from the same text, καὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, πορευόμενοι μαθητεύσατε, &c. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. Theodor. l. 1. c. 12. The same is also alledged by the Council of Antioch, under the Emperour Constantius, and Pope Julius. Socrat. l. 2. c. 10. Vide S. Athanas. in Epist. ad Ubique Orisbod. Orat. contra Gregales Sabellii, & contra Arianos, ex Deo Deus. vide Basil. de Sp. S. a. A. 8. 36, 37, b. v. 12.

baptized

baptized in the name of *Jesus Christ*: so is no more expressed of the faith required in them who were to be baptized, then to believe in the same name. But being the Father and the Holy Ghost were likewise mentioned in the first Institution, being the expressing of one doth not exclude the other, being it is certain that from the Apostles times the names of all three were used; hence upon the same ground was required faith, and a profession of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Again, as the Eunuch said not simply, I believe in the Son, but, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, as a brief explication of that part of the Institution, which he had learned before of *Philip*: So they who were converted unto Christianity were first taught not the bare names, but the explications and descriptions of them in a brief, easy and familiar way, which when they had rendred, acknowledged, and professed, they were baptized in them. And these being regularly and constantly used, made up the Rule of Faith, that is, the *Creed*. The truth of which may sufficiently be made apparent to any, who shall seriously consider the constant practise of the Church, from the first Age unto this present, of delivering the Rule of Faith to those which were to be baptized, and so requiring of themselves or their Sureties an expresse recitation, profession or acknowledgement of the Creed. From whence this observation is properly deduceable; That in what sense the name of *Father* is taken in the

Aff. 2. 38. and 8. 16. and 10. 48. and 19. 5.

* ὁ τὸν καὶ
νόνα τῆς ἀ-
ληθείας ἀκλ-
ητῆς ἐν ἑαυτῷ
κατέχων ἐν
διὰ τοῦ βα-
πτισμοῦ ὡς
ἀποσ. Irenaeus,
l. 1. c. 1.
Cum sub tri-
bus & testatio
fidei & sponso
salutis pigno-
rentur, ne-
cessario adjici-
tur Ecclesiae

mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quae trium corpus est. *Tertull. de Baptis.* In quem tingeret? in poenitentiam? quo ergo illi praecursorem? in peccatorum remissionem, quam verbo dabat? in semetipsum, quem humilitate celabat? in Spiritum Sanctum, qui nondum à Patre descenderat? in Ecclesiam, quam nondum Apostoli struxerant? *Id.* Dehinc ter mergimur, amplius aliquid respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. *Id. de Cor. Militis.* Sed & ipsa interrogatio quae fit in Baptismo testis est veritatis, nam cum dicimus, *Credis in vitam aeternam, & remissionem peccatorum per Sanctam Ecclesiam?* intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari. *S. Cyprianus, Ep. ad Januarium, &c.* Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut di-

eat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem Symbolo quo & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propterea usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in interrogatione baptismi à nobis non discrepare: sciat quisquis hoc opponendum putat, non esse unam nobis & Schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum, & vitam æternam per Sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habent Ecclesiam. Idem *Epist. ad Magnum*. Mos ibi (i. e. *Rome*) servatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam Baptismi susceperunt sunt, publice, id est, fidelium populo audiente, Symbolum reddere. *Ruffin. in Symb.* Solenne est in lavacro, post Trinitatis confessionem interrogare, *Credis in Sanctam Ecclesiam? credis remissionem peccatorum?* S. Hieron. contra *Lucifer*. Mens hæretica reliquit Doctorem à quo fidem Ecclesiæ didicerat, oblita est pacti Dei sui, hoc est, fidei ipsius Dominicæ quæ in Symbolo continetur, quam se die baptismatis servaturum esse promiserat. *Id. Comm. in Prov.* Interrogatus es, *Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem?* dixisti, Credo, & merxisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, *Credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum & in crucem ejus?* dixisti, Credo, & merxisti, ideo & Christoes consepultus. Tertio interrogatus, *Credis in Spiritum Sanctum?* dixisti, Credo; tertio merxisti: ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio. *Ambros. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 7.* Καθὼς παραδέχομεν παρὰ τοῦ τοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λεβὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν. *Euseb. of the confession of faith which he exhibited to the Council of Nice. Socr. l. 1. c. 8. Theodor. l. 1. c. 12.* Abrenuncio, inquis, Diabolo, pompis, spectaculis, & operibus ejus; & quid postea? Credo, inquis, in Deum Patrem omnipotentem. *Salvianus, de Gubern. Dei. l. 6.* And when this Creed was enlarged by the Council of Nice, and after that by others, Epiphanius commends it to the Catechumeni, to be repeated at their Baptisme; ἕως ἐκαστὸς τοῦ κατηχημένων τοῦ μαλλόντων τὸ ἀγίον λεβὸν προσέειπαι, ἡ μόνον ἀπαγγέλλειν οὐ φέρετε τὸ πρῶτον τῆς ἐκείνου ἡμεῖς οὐ κωλύω, ἀλλὰ καὶ διδάσκουσιν ῥητῶς, ὡς πάντων ἡ αὐτὴ μητὴρ ὑμῶν τὴ καὶ ἡμῶν, τὸ λέγειν, Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, &c. *Epiph. in Ancorato.* And when he had yet further enlarged it by reason of some new emergent heresies, he commends it, μάλιστα τοῖς τὸ ἀγίον λεβὸν προσέειπαι, ἵνα ἀπαγγέλλωσι καὶ λέγωσιν ἕως. *Ib.* The first Council of Constantinople confirms the Nicene Confession as πρῶτον τὴν καὶ ἀκρόατον τὸ βαπτίσματι. *Theodor. l. 5. c. 9.* and the Council of Chalcedon of the same, ἡν, ὡς κοινὸν ἐξ ἀγίων συνάμα, τοῖς μνημέοις πρὸς τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως παραγνωμὴν ἀσφάλεια. *Parte tertia, the Synod at Hierusalem, τὸ ἄγιον Σύμβολον εἰς ὃ ἐκατήιδμεν καὶ βαπτίζομεν. the Synod at Tyre, ὡν αὐτὸ βαπτίζοντες καὶ βαπτίζοντες. and the Council of Constantinople under Menna, to which the former, sent their Synodical Letters, τὸ ἄγιον Σύμβολον ὡν ὅ πάντες ἐκατήιδμεν. Concil. Constantinop. sub Agap. & Menna. Act. 5. Basiliscus & Marcus in two several Edict, confirmed the same Nicene Creed with these words, εἰς ὃ ἡμεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πρῆσαντες ἐκατήιδμεν. *Euagr. l. 3. c. 4. & 7.* and the Edict of the Emperour Justinian, Anathematizaverunt eos, qui aliam definitionem fidei, five Symbolum, five Mathema tradunt accedentibus ad sanctum baptismum.*

Forme

Forme of Baptisme, in the same it also ought to be taken in this Article. And being nothing can be more clear, then that, when it is said, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son*, the notion of *Father* hath in this particular no other relation but to that Son whose name is joyned with his; and as we are baptized into no other Son of that *Father*, but that only-begotten Christ Jesus, so into no other Father, but the father of that only-begotten: it followeth, that the proper explication of the first words of the Creed is this; *I believe in God the Father of Christ Jesus*.

In vain then is that vulgar distinction applied unto the explication of the Creed, whereby the Father is considered both personally, and essentially: personally, as the first in the glorious Trinity, with relation and opposition to the Son; essentially, as comprehending the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For that the Son is not here comprehended in the Father, is evident, not only out of the Originall, but also from the very letter of the Creed, which teacheth us to *believe in God the Father, and in his Son*; for if the Son were included in the Father, then were the Son the Father of himself. As therefore when I say, *I believe in Jesus Christ his Son*, I must necessarily understand the Son of that Father whom I mentioned in the first Article; so when I said, *I believe in God the Father*, I must as necessarily be understood of the Father of him, whom I call *his Son* in the second Article.

Pater cum au-
dis, Filii intel-
lige patrem, qui
filius supradi-
ctæ sit imago
substantiæ.
Ruff. in Symb.

Now as it cannot be denied that God may severall wayes be said to be the Father of Christ: First, as he was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; Secondly, as he was sent by him with speciall authority, as the King of Israel; Thirdly, as he was raised from the dead, out of the womb of the earth unto immortall life, and made heir of all things in his fathers house: So must we not doubt but, beside all these, God is the Father of

Luke 1.35.
John 10.35,
36. and 1.49.
Act. 13.32,33.

John 1. 1.

* ἀμα γὰρ ὅτι
θεός ἐστι ἀμα
πατήρ· ὅτι ὁ
τελειώσαν· ὅτι
χρὶς τὸ εἶναι
τὴν γέννησιν,
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν πρὶν
εἶναι πατήρ
καὶ υἱός, καὶ
νοούμενος.
S. Cyril, Dial.
de Trin. 2.

Πατὴρ αἰεὶ
πατήρ, καὶ ὁ
ἦν καὶ ἐξ ὧν
ἦν ὁ πατήρ
πατήρ. Epiph.
Hares. 62.

Sicut nunquam fuit non Deus, ita nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo filius natus. Gennad. de Ecclef. Dogm. c. 11. Credimus in Deum, eundem confitemur Patrem, ut eundem semper habuisse filium nos credamus. Chrysost. Sermon. 59. In ist Deo pietas, est in Deo semper affectio, paternitas permanet apud illum: semper ergo filium fuisse credas, ne patrem semper non fuisse blasphemem. Id. Sermon. 62. Adverte, quod cum Dei Patris nomen in Confessione conjungit, ostendit quod non ante Deus esse coeperit, & postea pater, sed sine ullo initio & Deus semper, & pater est. Aug. de Temp. Sermon. 132. † Deus solus proprie verus est pater, qui sine initio & sine pater est; non enim aliquando coepit esse quod pater est, sed semper pater est, semper habens filium ex se genitum. Faustinus, lib. contra Arianos. ὅτι τῆς θεότητος ὁ μόνος ὁ πατὴρ κυρίως ὁ πατὴρ ὅτι, καὶ ὁ υἱός κυρίως υἱός ὅτι. καὶ ὅτι τέτων τῶν μόνων ἔσκε τὸ πατὴρ αἰεὶ πατὴρ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ υἱός αἰεὶ υἱός εἶναι. S. Athanas. Disput. contra Arianos. || ἐπὶ μόνος τῆς θεότητος τὸ πατήρ καὶ τὸ υἱός ἔσκε. καὶ ἔστιν αἰεὶ. ἥ μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων οἱ πατὴρ λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἑτέροις χρόνον υἱός, καὶ οἱ υἱός λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἑτέροις λέγεται πατήρ. ὥστε ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὴ λέγεται κυρίως τὸ πατὴρ καὶ υἱός ὄνομα. S. Athanas. Tom. I. πατὴρ κυρίως.

A further

that Son in a more eminent and peculiar manner, as he is and ever was with God, and God: which shall be demonstrated fully in the second Article, when we come to shew how Christ is the onely-begotten Son. And according unto this Paternity by way of generation totally divine, in which he who begetteth is God, and he which is begotten, the same God, do we believe in God, as the eternal Father of an eternal Son. Which relation is coæval with his essence: so that we are not to imagine one without the other; but as we profess him alwayes God, so must we acknowledge him * alwayes Father, and that in a farre more † proper manner then the same title can be given to any Creature. Such is the fluctuant condition of humane generation, and of those relations which arise from thence, that he which is this day a son, the next may prove a father, and within the space of one day more, without any real alteration in himself, become neither son nor father, losing one relation by the death of him that begot him, and the other by the departure of him that was begotten by him. But in the Godhead these relations are more || proper, because fixed, the Father having never been a Son, the Son never becoming Father.

ὅτι μὴ υἱός· ὡς καὶ υἱὸς κυρίου, ὅτι μὴ καὶ πατήρ. τὰ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἔκκλη-
σιαις, ὅτι καὶ ἄμφω. Greg. N. z. Orat. 35.

A further reason of the propriety of God's Paternity appears from this: that he hath begotten a Son of the same nature and essence with himself, not onely specifically, but individually, as I shall also demonstrate in the exposition of the second Article. For Generation being the production of the like, and that likeness being the similitude of substance, where is the nearest identity of nature, there must be also the most proper generation, & consequently, he which generateth, the most proper father. If therefore man, who by the benediction of God, given unto him at his first creation in these words, *a Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth*, begetteth a son *b in his own likeness*, after his image, that is, of the same humane nature, of the same substance with him (which if he did not, he should not according to the benediction multiply himself or man at all,) with which similitude of nature many accidental disparities may consist, if by this act of generation he obtaineth the name of Father, because, and in regard of the similitude of his nature in the Son; how much more properly must that name belong unto God himself, who hath begotten a Son of a nature and essence so totally like, so totally the same, that no accidentall disparity can imaginably consist with that identity?

That God is the proper and eternal Father of his own eternal Son is now declared; what is the eminency or excellency of this relation followeth to be considered. In general then we may safely observe, that in the very name of father there is something above that of son; and some kind of priority we must ascribe unto him whom we call the first, in respect of him whom we term the second person: and as we cannot but ascribe it, so must we endeavour to preserve it. Now that priviledge or priority

pativitas. S. Aug. † τὸ μὲν ἀρχοντὶ πατρὶ δὲ υἱὸν ἀξίωμα φυλακίσθαι, μηδὲν αὐ-
τῷ ἐναντιοῦν τὸν ἀπογενέσθαι. Alexand. apud Theodoret. l. 1. c. 4. † ἡμεῖς

* Etiam si filius hominis homo in quibusdam similis, in quibusdam sit dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiae est, negari verus filius non potest; & quia verus est filius, negari ejusdem substantiae non potest. S. Aug. l. 3. cont. Max. c. 15. vide Tho. Sum. p. 1. q. 33. a. 2. ad quart. a Gen. 1. 28. b Gen. 9. 3.

* αὐτὸ τὸ ὀνομα τῷ πατρί· ὅτι καὶ υἱὸς ἐστὶν τοῦ πατρὸς. Syn. Sardin. Theodor. l. 2. c. 8. Infinitur nobis in Patre autoritas, in filio

ὅτι κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αἰτίαν πατρὶς τὰ ἔξ αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται, προτετάχθαι τῷ υἱῷ τὸν πατέρα φαμέν, κατὰ δὲ τῆς φύσεως διαφορᾶν ἔχον. S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1.

consisteth not in this, that the essence or attributes of the one are greater then the essence or attributes of the other, for we shall hereafter demonstrate them to be the same in both: but onely in this, that the Father hath that essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father. From whence he acknowledgeth that he is *from him*, that he *liveth by him*, that the *father gave him to have life in himself*, and generally referreth all things to him, as received from him. Wherefore in this sense some of the Ancients have not stuck to interpret those words, *the father is greater then I*, of Christ as the Son of God, as the second person in the blessed Trinity; but still with reference not unto his essence, but his generation, by which he is understood to have his being from the Father, who

John 7. 29.

John 6. 57.

John 5. 26.

John 14. 28.

μείζων ἔπιν,
ἢ μαχόμεν πνί,
ἢ δὲ ἔχονω,
ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν
ἔξ αὐτοῦ τῷ
πατρί τῷ

υἱοῦ. S. Athanas. contra Arrianos, l. 2. Λοίπῳ τοίνυν κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον ἐνταῦθα τὸ μείζων λέγεσθαι. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ υἱῶ, κατὰ τὸ τοῦ μείζωνος ὁ πατὴρ, ὡς αἴτιος καὶ ἀρχὴ. διὸ καὶ ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ὁ πατὴρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶ, καὶ δὲ πατρὸς δηλονότι. τὸ δὲ πατὴρ τί ἄλλο σημαίνει; ἢ ἔχον τὸ αἰτία εἶναι καὶ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ἔξ αὐτοῦ ἡγνυμένῳ; S. Basil. contra Eunom. l. 1. τὸ μείζων μὲν ἔστι τῆς αἰτίας, τὸ δὲ ἴσον τῆς φύσεως. Nazian. Orat. 36. Ὁ Orat. 40. ἢ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸ μείζων, κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν δέ. vide Epiph. in Ancor. c. 17. οἱ δὲ λέγουσι τὸ μείζονα εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καὶ δὲ αὐτῷ τῷ υἱῷ, ἢ δὲ τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶναι. S. Chrys. Homil. in Joan. 75. Ideo totum quod habet, quod potest, non tribuit sibi, sed Patri, quia non est à seipso, sed à Patre. Æqualis est enim Patri, sed hoc quoque accepit à Patre. S. Aug. Epist. 66. Necesse est quodammodo prior sit quia Pater sit. Quoniam antecedit necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habens originem, quia nascitur. Novatianus. Major itaque Pater filio est, & plane major, cui tantum donat esse, quantus ipse est, cui innascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in forma sua generat. S. Hilary. de Trinit. l. 9. Non præstantem quoniam cuiquam genere substantiæ, sed subjectum alterum alteri nativitate naturæ: Patrem in eo majorem esse quod Pater est, Filium in eo non minorem esse quod filius sit. Id. de Synod. contra Arrianos. Quis Patrem non potius confitebitur ut ingenuum à genito, ut Patrem à filio, ut eum qui miserit ab eo qui missus est, ut volentem ab ipso qui obediat? & ipse nobis testis est, Pater major me est. Id. de Trin. l. 3. In eo quod in se sunt Dei, ex Deo divinitatem cognosce; in eo vero quod Pater major est, confessionem paternæ autoritatis intellige. Id. l. 11. And before only

all these, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria; τὸ δὲ ἀρρύντων τὸ πατρὶ μόνον ἰδιωμα παρῆναι δοξαζόντες, ἅτε διὰ αὐτὸ πάσκειν τῷ ὢντι, ὁ πατὴρ μὲν μείζων μὲν ἐστὶ. Theodor. Hist. l. i. c. 4. Lastly, we have the Testimony of Photius, that many of the ancient Fathers so expounded it. τὴν δὲ πατὴρ μὲν μείζων μὲν ἐστὶ, τὸ εὐαγγελίου φωνὴν, διαφόρως οἱ πατέρες ἡμεῖς ἐξηλήφασιν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ φασὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μείζονα εἰρηθεῖν. Epist. 176. Aequalis Patri, sed major Pater, quod ipse dedit ipsi omnia, & causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, ut isto modo sit. Victor. Afer l. i. Pater inquit major me est, merito major, quia solus hic auctor sine auctore est. Phœbadius.

only hath it of himself, and is the original of all power and essence in the Son. *I can of mine own self do nothing*, saith our Saviour, 'because he is not of himself; & whosoever receives his being, must receive his power from another, especially where the essence and the power are undeniably the same, as in God they are. *The Son then can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do*, because he hath not power of himself, but what the Father gave; and being he gave him all the power, as communicating his entire & undivided essence, therefore *what things soever he doth, these also doth the son likewise*, by the same power by which the Father worketh, because he had received the same Godhead in which the Father subsisteth. There is nothing more intimate and essential to any thing than the Life thereof, and that in nothing so conspicuous as in the Godhead, where life and truth are so inseparable, that there can be no living God but the true, no true God but

Fahn 5. 30, 19.

* Quicquid filius habet ut faciat, à Patre habet ut faciat.

Quare habet à Patre ut faciat? quia à Patre habet ut filius sit; quia à Patre habet ut possit; quia à patre habet ut sit.

S. Aug. Tract. 20. in Joan.

† Non alia potentia est in filio, & alia substantia; sed ipsa est potentia quæ substantia: substantia

tia ut sit, potentia ut possit. Ergo quia Filius de Patre est, ideo dixit, *non potest Filius à se facere quicquam*; quia non est filius à se, ideo non potest à se. *Ibid.* Totum quod est, de Patre est; totum quod potest, de Patre est; quoniam quod potest & est, de Patre totum est. *Ibid.* Non potest, Filius à se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem; quia de Patre est totus Filius, & tota substantia & potentia ejus ex illo est qui genuit eum. *Id.* Tract. 21. Et primum Filium cognosce, cum dicitur, Non potest Filius à se facere quicquam, nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem. Habes nativitatem Filii, quæ ab se nihil potest facere nisi videat. In eo autem quod à se nihil potest, innascibilitatis admittit errorem. Ab se enim non potest posse nativitas. S. Hier. de Trin. l. 7. Dum non à se facit, ad id quod agit secundum nativitatem sibi Pater auctor est. *Id.* l. 11. Autorem discrevit, cum the

ait, Non potest à se facere : Obedientiam significat, cum addit, Nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem. *Id. de Synod.*

Jer. 10. 10. the living. *The Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting King,* saith the Prophet *Jeremy.* and *S. Paul* putteth the *Thessalonians* in mind, how they turned from idols to serve the living and true God. Now

1 Thes. 1. 9. life is otherwise in God then in the creatures : in him originally, in them derivatively ; in him as in the fountain of absolute perfection, in them by way of dependance and participation : our life is in him, but his is in himself ; and

*Jo. 5. 26.** Sicut * *as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.* † both the same life, both in themselves, both in the same degree, *as* the one, *so* the other ; but onely with this difference, the Father giveth it, and the Son receiveth it. From whence he professeth of himself, that *the living Father sent him, and that he liveth || by the Father.*

inter Patrem & filium, quia Pater habet vitam in semetipso quam nemo ei dedit, Filius autem habet vitam in semetipso quam Pater dedit. *S. Aug. Tract. 19. in Job.* Incommutabilis est vita filii sicut & Patris, & tamen de Patre est : & inseparabilis est operatio patris & filii ; sed tamen ita operari Filio de illo est, de quo ipse est, id est, de Patre. *Id. de Trin. l. 2. c. 1.* † Sicut habet, dedit ; qualem habet, dedit ; quantam habet, tantam dedit. *Id. contra Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.* Ergo quod dicitur *dedit filio*, tale est ac si diceretur, genuit filium, generando enim dedit. Quomodo enim dedit ut esset, sic dedit ut vita esset, et sic dedit ut in semetipso vita esset. *Id. Tract. 22. in Job.* Tali confessione originis suæ indiscretæ naturæ perfectæ nativitas est. Quod enim in utroque vita est id in utroque significatur essentia, & vita quæ generatur ex vita, id est, essentia quæ de essentia nascitur, dum non dissimilis nascitur scilicet, quia vita ex vita est, tenet in se indissimilem naturam originis suæ, quia & natæ et gignentis essentia, id est, vitæ quæ habetur et data est similitudo non discreper. *S. Hilar. de Synod. advers. Arrianos.* Quia ergo apparet vita Patris hoc esse quod ipse est ; sicut habet vitam in se, sic dedit : sic dedit Filio habere vitam, id est, sic est esse Filii, sicut esse Patris. *Vigil. Africanus Disput.* In vita naturæ & essentia significatio est, quæ sicut habetur, ita data esse docetur ad habendum. *S. Hilar. ib.* || Propter Patrem vivit Filius, quod ex Patre Filius est : propter Patrem, quod eructatum est verbum ex Patris corde, quod à Patre processit, quod ex paterno generatus est utero, quod fons Pater Filii est, quod radix Pater Filii est. *S. Ambros. de Fide, l. 4. c. 5.*

We must not therefore so farre endeavour to involve our selves in the darknesse of this mystery, as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father; whose pre-eminence undeniably consisteth in this, that he is God not of any others but of himself, and that there is no other who is God, but is God of him. It is no diminution to the Son, to say he is from another, for his very name imports as much: but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of him: and there must be some pre-eminence, where there is place for derogation. * What the Father is, he is from none; what the Son is, he is from him: what the first is, he giveth; what the second is, he receiveth. The first is a Father indeed by reason of his Son, but he is not God by reason of him; whereas the Son is not so only in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

* Pater de nullo patre, Filius de Deo Patre. Pater quod est, à nullo est; quod autem Pater est, propter Filium est. Filius vero & quod filius est,

propter Patrem est, & quod est, à Patre est. *S. Aug. Tract. 19. in Joh. Filium dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem autem Deum tantum, non de Deo. Unde manifestum est quod Filius habet alium de quo sit, & cui Filius est; Pater autem non filium de quo sit habeat, sed cui Pater sit. Omnis enim filius de patre est quod est, & patri filius est: nullus autem pater de filio est quod est, sed filio pater est. Id. de Trin. l. 2. c. 1. Filius non hoc tantum habet nascendo ut Filius sit, sed omnino ut sit. Ib. l. 5. c. 14. Filius non tantum ut sit Filius, quod relative dicitur, sed omnino ut sit, ipsam substantiam nascendo habet. Ibid. c. 15. Pater non habet patrem de quo sit, Filius autem de Patre est ut sit, atque ut illi coæternus sit. Ib. l. 6. c. 10. Ab ipso, inquit, sum; quia filius de Patre, & quicquid est filius, de illo est cujus est filius. Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo: & dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lumine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen: ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixit, Ab ipso sum. Ib. Tract. in Joh. 31. Pater non est si non habeat Filium, & Filius non est si non habeat Patrem: sed tamen Filius Deus de Patre, Pater autem Deus, sed non de Filio: Pater Filii, non Deus de Filio, ille autem Filius Patris, & Deus de Patre. Id. Tract. 30. in Joh. Hoc tamen inter Patrem & Filium interest, quia Pater à nullo hoc accepit, Filius autem per generationem omnia Patris accepit. Ambr. in Epist. ad Eph. c. 7. Est ergo Deus Pater omnium, insitutor & creator, solus originem nesciens. Novat. de Trinit. c. 31. whereas he speaks after of the Son, Est ergo Deus, sed in hoc ipsum genitus, ut esset Deus. Pater est Deus de quo Filius est Deus, de quo autem Pater nullus est Deus. S. Aug. 66.*

Heb. 3. 1.

Jo. 20. 21.

* Solus Pater non legitur missus, quia solus non habet autorem à quo genitus sit, vel à quo procedat. Et ideo non propter naturæ diversitatem, sed propter ipsam auctoritatem, solus Pater non dicitur missus: non enim splendor aut fervor ignem, sed ignis mittit sive splendorem sive fervorem.

S. Aug. cont.

Serm. Arrian.

c. 4.

Qui mittit, potestatem suam in eo quod mittit ostendit.

S. Hilari. l. 8. a Mat. 28. 33. b Heb. 1. 1.

† Si voluisset Deus Pater per subiectam creaturam visibiliter apparere, absurdissime tamen aut à Filio quem genuit, aut à Spiritu Sancto qui de illo procedit, missus diceretur. S. Aug. de Trin. l. 4. cap. ult. c Jo. 6. 57. d Jo. 7. 29. ¶ Filius est igitur à Patre missus, non Pater à Filio, quia Filius est à Patre natus, non Pater à Filio. Fulgent. l. 5. cont. Fabianum, in Collect. Theodul. de S. S. Quis autem Christianus ignorat quod Pater miserit, missusque sit Filius? Non enim genitorem ab eo quem gignit, sed genitum à genitore mitti

Upon this preeminence (as I conceive) may safely be grounded the congruity of the Divine Mission. We often read that Christ was sent, from whence he bears the name of an *Apostle* himself, as well as those whom he therefore named so, because as the Father sent him, so sent he them: The Holy Ghost is also said to be sent, sometimes by the Father, sometimes by the Son; but we never read that the Father was sent at all, there being an authority in that name which seems inconsistent with this mission. In the Parable *a certain householder which planted a Vineyard, first sent his servants to the husbandmen, and again other servants, but last of all he sent unto them his Son*: it had been inconsistent even with the literall sense of an historicall parable, as not at all consonant to the rational customes of men, to have said, that last of all, the Son sent his Father to them. So God placing man in the Vineyard of his Church, first sent his servants the prophets, by whom he *spake at sundry times and in divers manners*; but *in the last dayes he sent his Son*: and it were as † incongruous and inconsistent with the divine generation, that the Son should send the Father into the world. c *As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father*, saith our Saviour; intimating that by whom he lived, by him he was sent, and therefore sent by him, because he lived by him, laying his generation as the proper ground of his mission. Thus he which begetteth sendeth, and he which is ‖ begotten is sent. d *For I am from him, and he hath sent me*, saith the Son: from whom I received my essence by communication, from

him

oportebat. S. Aug. contra Maxim. l. 3. c. 14. Ubi aulic, ipse me misit, nolite
intellige e natura dissimilitudinem, sed generantis auctoritatem. Id. Tract. 31.
in Joh. *Ἐνταῦθα ἔνδ' ἀποστείλας καὶ ὁ ἀποστέλλόμενος*. Ὁ, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι πάντως
ἀγαθὸν μᾶλλον εἶναι τὴν πηγὴν, τὴν τῶν Πατέρων. Epiph. Hæres. 69. 54.
Hence the language of the Schools, Missio importat processionem originis,
as Thom. Aquin. 1^o. q. 43. ar. 1. ad primum; or auctoritatem principis, as
Durand. l. 1. dist. 15. q. 1.

him also received I this commission. As therefore it is
more worthy to give then to receive, to send then to be
sent; so in respect of the Sonship there is some priority in
the divine Paternity: from whence divers of the Ancients
read that place of S. John with this addition, *a the Fa-
ther (which sent me) is greater then I*. He then is that
b God who sent forth his Son made of a woman, that God
who hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts,
crying, *Abba Father*. So that the authority of sending
is in the Father: which therefore ought to be acknow-
ledged, because upon this mission is founded the highest
testimony of his love to man. for herein is love, saith
S. John, *not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and
sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*.

† *Ἀκούετε
τὸ φητὸν τῶ
Εὐαγγελίῳ
κακῶς ἑρμη-
νεύοντες, ὅτι
ὁ ἀποστείλας
με πατὴρ
μὴ ζῶν με ἐστίν.*
saith Epipha-
nius of the Ar-
rians; and an-
swering, grants
in these words
which follow,
καὶ ἐμὸν

μὲν ὁ ἀποστείλας με πατὴρ φάσκει, καὶ ὁ κτίσας με. Hæres. 69. 53. To the
same purpose Athanas. de Hum. Nat. Suse. & Cyril. Thesau. l. 11. read it *ὁ πᾶς*
με πατήρ. and S. Basil makes Eunomius read it so, in his first book against him,
and with this addition answers it. So the second Confession of the Council of Sirmium,
both in the Latin original, and Greek Translation. S. Hilary, de Syn. S. Athanas.
& Socr. l. 2. c. 3. a Joh. 14. 28. b Gal. 4. 4.

Again, the dignity of the Father will further yet appear
from the order of the persons in the blessed Trinity, of
which he is undoubtedly the first. For although in some
passages of the Apostolical discourses the Son may first
be named, (as in that of S. Paul, *the grace of our Lord* 2 Cor. 13. 14.
*Jesus Christ; and the love of God, and the communion of
the Holy Ghost be with you all,* (the later part of which is
nothing but an addition unto his constant Benediction;)

1 Cor. 12. 4,
5, 6.

* παραδιδύς
ὁ κρείττον τὴν
σωτήριον πίσιν
τοῖς μαθητευ-
ομένοις τῷ
λόγῳ, τῷ
πατρὶ καὶ τῷ
ὑψίστῳ κυνάρι
τὸ πνεῦμα
τὸ ἅγιον.

S. Basil. Epist.
80.

† Ἀκίνητον
καὶ ἀπαρε-
χέριτον φυ-
λάσσειν ὁσ-
ήκει τὴν ἀκο-

λυσίαν, ἣν εἶχε αὐτῆς τῷ κρείττῳ τῆς φωνῆς παρέλαβόμεν, εἰπόντ, πρεσβύτερος
μαθητῆσάτε πάντα, &c. S. Basil. Epist. 78. ἢ ἐστὶ τάξεως εἰδὸς ἐκ ὧν τῆς παρ'
ἡμῶν θέσεως συνιστάμενον, ἀλλ' αὐτῇ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθίᾳ Συμβῶνον,
ὡς τὸ πυρὶ περὶ τὸ φῶς ἐστὶ τὸ εἶς αὐτῷ. ἐν τέτοις γὰρ ὑπερτέρον τὸ αἷτιον
λέγομεν, δεύτερον δὲ τὸ εἶς αὐτῷ. πῶς ἔν ἐυλόγον ἀνείδει τὴν τάξιν ἐρ'
ὧν ὅτι πρότερον καὶ δεύτερον, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν θέσιν, ἀλλ' ὅτι τῆς κατὰ
φύσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκπαρχέσεως ἀκολουθίας; S. Basil. ad v. Eunom. l. i. * Δευ-
τερεῦν μὲν ὁ ὑπὸς τῷ πατρὶ τῷ αἰτίῳ. Δευτερεῦν δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῷ ὑψίστῳ
κατὰ τὸν τῆς αἰτίας λόγον. S. Basil. apud Georg. Pachym. Hist. l. 7. ὡς μὲν
γὰρ ὁ εἶς τῷ πατρὶ τῷ αἰτίῳ, καὶ ἀξιώματι, ὅτι ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τῷ ὄντι
αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ ὅτι αὐτῷ ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ὁ ἀρχὸς καὶ ὁ ἀρχηγὸς καὶ ὁ ἀρχηγός, καὶ
φύσει δὲ ἐκείνῳ δεύτερος, διότι ἡ διότις ἐν ἐκατέρῳ μία. ἔτι δὲ διλογότερον καὶ τὸ
πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τὸν ὑπὸν τῇ τε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι, ἐκείνῳ
αὖ ἐκόντως ὡς ἄλλοτρίᾳ ὑπάρχον φύσεως; S. Basil. cont. Eunom. l. 3. Si unum Deum
singulariter nominamus excludentes vocabulum secundæ personæ, furorem ejus hæ-
resis approbamus, quæ ipsum asserit Patrem passum. Phæbad. cont. Arria. Illi cui est in
Filio secunda persona, est & tertia in Sp. Sancto. Id. Sic alius à Filio Spiritus, sicut à
Patre Filius: sic tertia in Spiritu, ut in Filio secunda persona. Ib. Omne quod prodit
ex aliquo, secundum sit ejus necesse est de quo prodit, non tamen est separatum.
Secundum autem ubi est, duo sunt, & certius ubi est, tres sunt: tertius enim est Spi-
ritus à Deo & Filio: Tertius, adverb. Præcæm, c. 8. Sic alium à se Paracletum,

quomodo & nos à Patre alium Filium; ut tertium gradum ostenderet in Paracleto, sicut nos secundum in Filio. *Ib.* c. 9. Hic interim acceptum à Patre munus effudit Spiritum Sanctum, tertium numen divinitatis, & tertium nomen majestatis. c. 30. *Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς μαρτυρῶν ὕδους, δεύτερον ὅτι ὕδους καὶ πνεύματος, παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ ποιῆσαι εἶναι εἰληφώς.* Euseb. *Dem. Evang.* l. 4. c. 3. Et quidem confessione communi secunda quidem ab autore nativitas est, quia ex Deo est; non tamen separabilis ab autore, quia in quantum sensus noster intelligentiam tentabit excedere, in tantum necesse est etiam generatio excedat. *S. Hilar. de Trinit.* l. 12. Tua enim res est, & unigenitus tuus est filius ex te deo pater deus verus, & à te in naturæ tuæ veritate genitus, post te ita confitendus, ut tecum, quia æternæ originis suæ es author æternus. Nam dum ex te est, secundus à te est. *Id.* *This by the Schools is called ordo naturæ, ordo originis, ordo naturalis præsuppositionis.*

to want a sufficient foundation for this priority of the first person of the Trinity, if we look upon the numerous testimonies of the ancient Doctors of the Church, who have not stuck to call the Father the origin, the cause,

† μικρὸν γὰρ ἂν εἴη καὶ ἀναξίων ἀρχῇ, μάλλον δὲ μικρὸς ἢ καὶ ἀναξίως, μὴ δεύτην ὡς

ἀρχῇ καὶ ἀναδότῃ τῆς ἐν ὑπὸ καὶ πνεύματι θεωρουμένης. *Naz. Orat.* l. 1. c. 29. μὴ χρονικὴν ἀρχὴν τῇ ὑπὸ κατὰ δέξιν τινὸς λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ ἀχρονον ἀρχὴν γίνεσθαι τῇ πατρὶ. ἀρχὴ γὰρ ὑπὸ ἀχρονος, ἀκατάληπτος. *S. Cyril. Hier. Catech.* l. 1. ἀρχὴ μὲν ἐν πατρὶς ἐδεξία, ἀρχὴ δὲ τῇ ὑπὸ ὁ πατὴρ. *S. Bas. cont. Eunom.* l. 2. Cum dixisset, quem mittet pater, addidit, in nomine meo: non tamen dixit, quem mittet Pater à me, quemadmodum dixit, quem ego mittam vobis à Patre; viz. ostendens quod totius divinitatis, vel, si melius dicitur, deitatis principium Pater est. *S. Aug. de Trin.* l. 4. c. 20. Unum principium ad creaturam dicitur Deus, non duo vel tria principia. Ad se autem invicem in Trinitate, si gignens ad id quod gignitur principium est, Pater ad Filium principium est, quia gignit eum. *S. Aug. de Trin.* l. 5. c. 14. Pater ergo principium Deitatis. *Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat.* c. 1. In this sense the Greek Fathers used ἀναρχος as proper to the Father (in the same notion with ἀρχήνσις, with relation to the principium productionis,) and denied it to the Son. *Ὁ δὲ ὕδους, εἰ μὲν ὡς αὐτίον τῷ πατρὶ λαμβάνης, ἐκ ἀναρχος, ἀρχὴ γὰρ ὑπὸ ὁ πατὴρ ὡς αὐτίος: εἰ δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ χρόνου τοῦ ἀρχῇ, καὶ ἀναρχος.* *Naz. Orat.* l. 1. c. 29. εἰ τις ἀρχήνσιον καὶ ἀναρχον λέγοι τῷ ὑπὸ, ὡς δύο ἀναρχα, καὶ δύο ἀρχήνσια λέγων, καὶ δύο ποίων θεὸς, ἀνάδεμα ἔστω. *Synod. Sirm. Conf.* 12. Thus first translated into Latine, Si quis innascibilem, & sine initio dicat filium, tanquam duo sine principio, & duo innascibilia, & duo innata dicens, duos faciet deos, Anathema sit. *S. Hilar. de Synod.* In which sense the Platonists did understand ἀρχήνσιον of God. *Ὡς ἐκ ἀγαθὸν τῇ λεγομένη ὕλη τὸ κοσμοῦν, εἴτε ἀρχήνσιον εἴη μὴ ἀπὸ χρόνου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ αἰώνων, καθ' ὃ δημιουργήμενον καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀρχήνσιον λέγουμεν.* *Hierocles de Provid.* And the Latines attributing the terme principium to the Son, do it with the addition of de, or ex principio. Pater principium non de principio, Filius principium de principio. *S. Aug. contra Maxim.* l. 3. c. 17. Principium ex principio & unum est, & initio caret. *Faulus Rbeg. Epist.* 16. Ex ore, inquit, Altissimi

prodiui. Hæc est enim nativitas perfecta Sæmonis, hoc est principium sine principio, hic est ortus habens initium in nativitate, in statu non habens. Phœbad. contra Actia. Sicut in creaturis invenitur principium primum & principium secundum; ita in personis divinis invenitur principium non de principio, quod est Pater, & principium à principio, quod est Filius. Tho. Aquin. 1. q. 33. ar. 4. And to this all the Schoolmen writing on his Summes agree, as all upon the Sentences; 1. di. 29. * αἰτία ἐστὶν ἢ τῷ θεῷ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἢ τῷ υἱῷ, ἢ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, ἢ τῇ κτίσει πᾶσι. S. Athanas. Dissert. Orthod. & Anom. ἀλλὰ τίς ἐστὶ διὸς αἰτία ἀφ' ἧς ἀρχὴς ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν, ἢ περὶ αἰτίας τῆς ἀπαλλοτρίων ὄντων αἰτίας· οὐ γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ δὲ τὰ πάντα. S. Basil. Ep. 43. and upon that place, this day have I begotten thee; ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν γεγέννηκα, τὴν αἰτίαν ἀφ' ἧς ἔχει τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ εἶναι σημαίνει. Id. contra Eunom. 1. 2. πῶς ἡδεμία διαφοράν καταλείπει, ἡ δὲ τὴν ἐν αἰτίῳ πρὸς τὰ εἶς αὐτῷ ἐνυπαρχού. Id. 1. 1. Πρὸς τὸ, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἡλθον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, εἰ εἶναι θέλῃ, ὅτι ἀρχὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἢ αἰτίαν ἐπηγερόμεν & πατέρα ταῦτα λέγει. Id. Epist. 64. Διαφορὰν ἥν ὑποσάπων ἐν μόναις ταῖς τελῶν ἰδιότησι, τῇ ἀναίτητῃ ἢ πατρὶ, ἢ αἰπαλῇ ἢ κτῆ, ἢ τῇ αἰτιαλῇ ἢ ἐκπορευτῇ ἐπιγνώσκουμιν. Damasc. 1. 4. c. 5. & πατέρα τῷ λόγῳ ἢ τῇ σφίσι, ἢ προβολῇ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου, & πρώτῃ αἰτίαν ἢ ἀρχὴν φάμεν τῆς θεότητος εἶναι. Zachar. Mitylen. And although Thomas Aquinas, and Eugenius Bishop of Rome in the definition of the Council of Florence, have observed that the Greeks in this case do use the terme of causa, but the Latines onely principium; yet the very Latine Fathers in the 25. Session of the same Council have these words, μὴ γινώσκουμιν & πατέρα αἰτίαν, ἢ ῥίζαν, ἢ πηγὴν τῆς θεότητος. and we have before cited Victorinus Afer, who says, Pater causa est ipsi filio ut sit. So S. Hilary, Deum nasci, non est aliud quam in ea natura esse qua Deus est, quia nasci cum causam nativitatis ostendat, non disproficit tamen in genere auctoris existere. de Trin. 1. 11. Ex Spiritu enim Spiritus nascens, licet de proprietate Spiritus, per quam & ipse Spiritus est, nascatur, non tamen alia ei præterquam perfectarum atque inde-mutabilium causarum ad id quod nascitur causa est. & ex causa, licet perfecta atque inde-mutabili nascens, necesse est ex causa in causæ ipsius proprietate nascatur. Id. 1. 12. Qui ex eo qui est natus est, intelligi non potest ex eo quod non fuit natus esse, qui ejus qui est ad id quod est causa est, non etiam id quod non est origo nascendi est. Ibid. Deus omnium quæ sunt causa est. Quod autem rerum omnium causa est, etiam sapientiæ suæ causa est, nec unquam Deus sine sapientia sua. Igitur sempiternæ suæ sapientiæ causa est sempiterna. S. Aug. 1. 83. quæst. 16. And as they called the Father the cause of the Son, so they accounted in the propriety of the Father to be without a cause; as appears out of Alexander the Bp. of Alexandria's Epist. before produced.

* We have cited * the author, the † root, the ‖ fountain, and the § head Phœbadius of the Son, or the whole divinity.

speaking so

before; to which may be added: Si quis igitur adhuc & de Apostolo requirit dominicum statum, id est singularis substantiæ dualitatem quæ per naturam auctori suo jungi-

jungitur, & paulo post, sed cum refertur ex ipso, certe ad Patrem, ut ad rerum omnium
 respicitur auctorem. S. Hilary is known to speak frequently of the authority of the
 Father, as of the author of his Son; and severall places have been already collected,
 especially by Petavius, to which these may be added, besides what have been already
 produced. Ipso quod Pater dicitur, ejus quem genuit autor ostenditur. 1. 4. cum
 potius honor filii dignitas sit paterna, & gloriosus autor sit ex quo is,
 qui tali gloria sit dignus, extiterit. *Ibid.* Aliud est sine autore esse semper æter-
 num, aliud quod patri, id est, autori est cœternum. Ubi enim pater autor, ibi
 & nativitas est. At vero ubi autor æternus est, ibi & nativitas æterna est: quia
 sicut nativitas ab autore est, ita ab æterno autore æterna nativitas est. *Id.* l. 12.
 Quod vero ex æterno natum est, id si non æternum natum est, jam non erit & pater
 autor æternus. Si quid igitur ei qui ab æterno patre natus est ex æternitate defuerit,
 id ipsum autori non est ambiguum defuisse. *Ib.* Natum non post aliquid, sed ante
 omnia, ut nativitas tantum testetur autorem, non præposterum aliquid in se auto-
 re significet. *Ib.* Natus autem ita, ut nihil aliud quam te sibi significet auto-
 rem. *Ib.* Ipsius tamen auctor est Pater generando sine initio. *Ruff. in Symb.*
 Si propterea Deum Patrem Deo Filio dicis autorem, quia ille genuit, genitus est
 iste, quia iste de illo est, non ille de isto, fateor & concedo. S. August. *cons.*
Maximin. l. 3. c. 14. † Nec dubitaverim Filium dicere & radicis fruticem, &
 fontis fluvium, & solis radium. *Tertull. adv. Praxeam,* c. 8. Nec frutex ta-
 men à radice, nec fluvius à fonte, nec radius à sole discernitur, sicut nec à
 Deo sermo. *Ib.* Ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τέλειον ἔχων τὸ εἶναι καὶ ἀνεκδιαι-
 κτὸν, καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ εἶναι. S. Basil. *Homil.* 26. Dominus Pater, quia
 radix est Filii. S. Ambros. *in Luc.* l. 10. c. 1. ut & de Fide l. 4. c. 5. || ἀναρχος
 ὁ πατὴρ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεὸν διὰ τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ ὁ υἱός. *Cyrl. Hieros.*
Catech. 11. In hac ergo natura filius est, & in hoc originis fonte subsistens pro-
 cessit ex sapiente sapientia, ex forti virtus, ex lumine splendor. *Vigil. Disp.* ὡς
 πνεῦμα θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς αὐτὸ πρῶτος, αὐτίον αὐτὸ ἔχον, ὡς πηγὴν ἐκείνου καὶ ἐκείνου
 πηγῶν. Basil. *Homil.* 28. λέγει ἐπὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἡ εἰσαρχία, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς, ἐπὶ
 αὐτὸς ὡς πρῶτος οὐρανός, ἀπορουδμένος δηλονότι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τῆς
 τῆς ζωῆς, τῆς τῆς ζωῆς θεότητος. *Aët. Concil. Nic.* l. 2. c. 22. And S. Cyril.
of Alexandria, who often useth this expression, gives us the full signification of it, in
 these words, upon the 1. of S. John, ἀδικήσει ὃ ὅλως ἐστὶν τὸ, ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς, τὸ
 πατὴρ ὃ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκείνου ὡς πρῶτος ὁ μόνος γὰρ τὸ ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας
 σημαίνει. Patrem quidem non genitum, non creatum, sed ingentum proficemur, ipse
 enim à nullo originem ducit, ex quo & Filius nativitatem, & Spiritus Sanctus
 processionem accepit. Fons ergo ipse & origo est totius divinitatis. *Concil. To-
 lan.* 11. Quanto magis Dei vocem credendum est, & manere in æternum, & sensu
 ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam rivus de fonte traduxit, *Lactanti-
 de falsa Sap.* l. 4. c. 8. & rursus c. 29. Cum igitur & Pater Filium faciat, & Fi-
 lius Patrem, unus utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est: sed ille quasi
 exuberans fons est, hic tanquam defluens ex eo rivus; ille tanquam Sol, hic tan-
 quam radius à Sole porrectus. § Caput, quod est principium omnium, Filius;
 caput autem, quod est principium Christi, Deus. *Concil. Sirm.* accepted and expound-
 ed

ed as Oribodox by S. Hilary. Caput enim omnium Filius, sed caput Filii Deus. S. Hilary. de Syn. Cum ipse sit omnium caput, ipsius tamen caput est Pater. Ruff. in Symb. Tu capitis caput, & primi tu fontis origo. Hilary. ad Leonem. ἔτε δὲ εἰσὶν ἀρχαί, ἀλλὰ κεφαλὴ τῷ υἱῷ ὁ πατήρ, μὴ ἡ ἀρχή. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. 11. Caput Filii Pater est, & caput Spiritus Sancti Filius, quia de ipso accepit. S. Aug. Quæst. Vet. Test. 9. S. Chrysostome is so clearly of the opinion that the 1 Cor. 11. is to be understood of Christ as God, that from thence he proves him to have the same essence with God. εἰ γὰρ κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ὁ αὐτὸς, ὁμοῦστος ἢ ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος κεφαλὴ ἢ τῷ υἱῷ ὁ θεὸς, ὁμοῦστος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς. So likewise Theodoret upon the same place; ἢ ἢ γυνὴ ἢ πνεῦμα τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ὑσίας τῷ ἀνδρὶ. ἔδὲ ὁ υἱὸς ἀπὸ πνεύματος τῷ πατρὶ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ὑσίας τῷ πατρὶ.

For by these titles it appeareth clearly, first, that they made a considerable difference between the person of the Father, of whom are all things, and the person of the Son, by whom are all things. Secondly, that the difference consisteth properly in this, That as the branch is from the root, and river from the fountain, and by their origination from them receive that being which they have; whereas the root receiveth nothing from the branch, or fountain from the river: So the Son is from the Father, receiving his subsistence by generation from him, the Father is not from the Son, as being what he is from none. Some indeed of the Ancients may seem to have made yet a further difference between the persons of the Father and the Son, laying upon that relation terms of greater opposition. As if, because the Son hath not his essence from himself, the * Father had; because he was not begotten of himself, the † Father had been so; because he is not the cause of himself, ‖ the Father were. Whereas if we speak properly, God the Father hath * neither his being from another, nor from himself. not from another, that were repugnant to his paternity; not from himself, that were a

Qui putant Deum ejus potentia esse ut seipsum ipse genuerit, eo plus errant, quod non solum Deus ita non est, sed neque corporalis neque spiritualis creatura. Nulla enim omnino res est quæ seipsam gignat ut sit. Et ideo non est credendum, vel dicendum quod Deus genuit se. S. Aug.

con-

This appeareth by those expressions which have been given of such words as seem to bear

contradiction in it self. And therefore those expressions are not to be understood positively and affirmatively, but negatively and exclusively, that he hath his essence from none, that he is not begotten of any, nor hath he any cause of his existence.

the affirmation; as αὐτοχρόνου, αὐτοφύου, αὐτόνομος, αὐτοχρῆς, &c. Αὐτοχρῆς, αὐτοχρόνου, ἕκ ἐκ πνῶ ἡνωμένος. Hieron. and, Αὐτολόχευτος, Θεὸς ἀγέννητος, αὐτογέννητος. Id. and after him Suidas; Αὐτολόχευτος, αὐτογέννητος, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀγέννητος. And if αὐτογέννητος be not αὐτίθεν ἡγούμενος no more is αὐτίθεος to be taken for αὐτίθεν, or Ἐξ αὐτοῦ Θεός. Eusebius in his Panegyricall Oration gives this title to the Son, οἷα τῷ καὶ δόλου Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγούμενον καὶ αὐτίθεον προσχωρεῖν. Hist. l. 10. c. 4. and in his Evangelicall Demonstration, calls him αὐτοῦν καὶ αὐτολόχον καὶ αὐτοσφίαν, καὶ ἵτις ἡ αὐτοχρόνου καὶ αὐτοχρόνου. l. 4. c. 2. and in the 13. chapter of the same book, with relation to the former words, τῷ Θεῷ λόγος αὐτοζῶν τυγχάνων, καὶ αὐτοφῶς νοεῶν, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα προσχωρεῖται. Theodoret termes him, αὐτοδύναμον καὶ αὐτοζῶν καὶ αὐτοσφίαν contra Anathem. quartum Cyrill. S. Basil, αὐτοζῶν, in Psal. 48. and de Spiritu Sancto c. 8. and αὐτοδυναμίζων, Epist. 141. S. Chrysostome, αὐτοδυνασίου, αὐτομαχευότης. S. Athanasius gives him them, and many more to the same purpose. And certainly in the same sense that αὐτός is joyned with one attribute, it may be joyned with any other, and with the Godhead: because all the attributes of God are really the same, not onely with themselves, but with the essence. But in what sense it ought to be understood, when thus used by the Fathers, it will be necessary to enquire, least it be so attributed to the Son, as is prove derogatory to the Father. S. Basil, I confesse, may seem so to speak, as if the Son were therefore αὐτοζῶν, because he hath life of himself, not from the Father, (and consequently he may be termed αὐτίθεος, as God of himself, not from the Father;) for he denieth those words, I live by the Father, to be spoken of Christ according to his divine nature; and that onely for this reason, that if it were so understood, he could not be called αὐτοζῶν. Εἰ δὲ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς ζῇ, δι' ἑτερον, καὶ ὁ δι' αὐτοῦ ζῇ. ὁ δὲ δι' ἑτερον ζῶν αὐτοζῶν εἶναι εἰ δυνατόν. from whence he concludeth, εἰς τὸ καταρτίσθαι οὐκ, καὶ ἕκ ἐκ τῆς θεότητος τὸ εἰρημένον νοεῖν δεῖ. contra Eunom. l. 4. But because the authority of that Book is questioned, I shall produce the same Author upon the same Scripture, speaking to the same purpose, in his 141. Epistle, which is unquestionably genuine. ἐνταῦθα ὅτι τὸ ἡν ἕκ αὐτοῦ πεγαίνοντος, ὡς οἶμαι, ζῶν ὀνομάζει. πᾶν δὲ τὸ δι' ἑτερον ζῶν αὐτοζῶν εἶναι εἰ δυνατόν. To which testimonies I answer first, that those words of his, ὡς οἶμαι, (as I think) shews that he doth not absolutely deny these words of Christ to be understood of his divinity, of which the rest of the Fathers quoted before did understand it. and not onely they, but S. Basil himself in his Book de Spiritu Sancto, c. 8. hath delivered a clear resolution of this point according to that interpretation, wholly consonant to his doctrine of the Trinity in other parts of his works. Ὁμοῦ μὲν τοι ἵνα μὴ ποτε δεκ

τῷ μεγέθει καὶ ἐν ἐργασίῳ καὶ ἐν πατρὶσιν οἷς τὸ φαντασθῆναι ἀναρξον εἶναι καὶ
 κλειον, τί φησιν ἡ αὐτοζωή; ἔγωγε ζῶ διὰ τὸ πατέρα καὶ ἡ τῷ θεῷ δυνάμεις; ἡ δυνάμεις
 ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔστιν καὶ ἡ αὐτοτελής σοφία; ὅτι τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ τὴν
 λαλήσω. Christ therefore as αὐτοζωή, saith these words, I live by the Father, and by
 them shewed his origination from him, from whom he received his life, power and
 wisdom, as receiving his essence, which is the same with them. Wherefore those former
 passages are to be looked upon, as if αὐτὸς in composition did not deny origination, but
 participation, or receiving by way of affection. And that he understood it so appears out
 of the places themselves; for in the first, after ὁ δὲ ἐτερον ζῶν, αὐτοζωή εἶναι καὶ δυνά-
 ται, immediately followeth, ὅτι κατὰ χάριν ἄριστος αὐτοαριστος. and in the second,
 after πᾶν τὸ δὲ ἐτερον ζῶν αὐτοζωή εἶναι καὶ δυνάμεις, followeth likewise, ὡς ἔστι
 τὸ ὑπ' ἐτέρου θεομανθὲν αὐτοθερμότης εἶναι. The meaning then of S. Basil must be
 this, that he which receiveth life from another merely as a grace or favour, as the
 Saints receive their Sanctity, cannot properly be termed αὐτοζωή, no more then they
 αὐτοαριστοι; or if he receive it by derivation or participation, as water receiveth heat
 from fire, he deserveth the same name, no more then water heated to be called αὐτο-
 θερμότης. And this is fully consonant to the expressions of the rest of the Ancients;
 as particularly Athanasius; κατὰ μετοχὴν ταῦτα ὄν, ὅτι ἐξωθεν ἐπιγινόμενων
 τύπων αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸς αὐτῷ μετέχοντα, καὶ σοφισμοὺς δι' αὐτῷ, καὶ δυνά-
 τες, καὶ λογικὸς ἐν αὐτῷ γινόμενος. ἀλλ' αὐτοσοφία, αὐτολόγος, αὐτοδύναμις
 ἰδὲ τῷ πατρὶος ὄν, αὐτοφῶς, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, αὐτοαρετή. in
 fine Protrept. and to the same purpose, ὅτι ἐμδεκτικὴν ἔχει τὸ διειδέναι, ἀλλ' αὐ-
 τοπνεῦμα καὶ αὐτοῖον καὶ πάντων ἐστὶ καὶ ἀναδύν, αὐτοζωή, καὶ αὐτοφῶς, καὶ αὐτοα-
 λήθεια. in the M. Catena in the King of France his Library, Petav. de Trin.
 l. 6. c. 11. All therefore which these compositions signifie, is either a negation of a
 derivative participation, or an affirmation of a reality and identity of substance, as
 yet further appears by S. Epiphanius; αὐτοουσία ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ
 ἄριστον πνεῦμα, καὶ ὁ καὶ ἐτεροουσία. and Origen himself upon S. John, ἡ αὐτοδικαιο-
 σύνη ἡ ὑσιώδης Χεῖρ ἐστὶν. as also ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια ἡ ὑσιώδης, καὶ ἡ ὅπως εἶπω,
 ὁρωτότυπος τῆς ἐν ταῖς λογικαῖς ψυχαῖς ἀληθείας. To conclude, there is a
 Catholic sense in which the Son is termed αὐτόθεος, αὐτοσοφία, &c. by the An-
 cient Fathers; and another sense there is, in which these terms are so proper and
 peculiar to the Father, that they are denied to the Son. Indeed αὐτόθεος, in the
 highest sense, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ θεός, positively taken, belongeth neither to the Son nor
 to the Father, as implying a manifest contradiction; because nothing can have its be-
 ing actually from it self, as communicated to it self, and that by it self; but in a Ne-
 gative way of interpretation, by which that is said to be of it self, which is, and yet
 is not of or from another, αὐτόθεος belongs properly to the Father, neither generated
 by, nor proceeding from another; and in that sense it is denied to the Son, because
 he is generated by the Father, as ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ σοφῆς σοφίας, ἐκ λογικῆς λόγου,
 καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς υἱός, saith S. Athanasius cont. Arrian. O. ar. 5. from whence he thus
 proceeds, ἐκτὸς ἐστὶ μὴ ἂν τις εἴποι αὐτοσοφία εἶναι καὶ αὐτολόγον τὸ θεόν, ἀλλ'
 ἐκ τούτου. ἐν ᾧ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ πατρὶ καὶ υἱός. and again ἐκτὸς αὐτοσοφίας ὁ θεός, καὶ
 τὸ ἐκ τούτου αὐτοπον εἶρη. καὶ Σαββίλω. Lastly in another sense, in which
 αὐτὸς

αὐτὸς in composition is taken not in obliquo, but in recto, αὐτόθεος, that is, αὐτὸς ὁ θεός, God himself, and αὐτοζών, αὐτὴ ἡ ζώνη, life it self: So all these terms are attributed to the Son as truly, really, and essentially as to the Father.

Howsoever, it is most necessary to assert that there is but one Person who is from none; and the very generation of the Son, and procession of the Holy Ghost undeniably prove, that neither of those two can be that person. for whosoever is generated is from him which is the generator, and whosoever proceedeth is from him from whom he proceedeth, whatsoever the nature of the generation or procession be. It followeth therefore that this Person is the Father, which name speaks nothing of dependence, nor supposeth any kind of priority in another. Which, as it is most true, and so fit to be believed, is also a most necessary truth, and therefore to be acknowledged, for the avoiding * multiplication and plurality of Gods. For if there were more then one which were from none, it could not be denied, but there were more Gods then one. Wherefore this † origination in the divine Paternity hath anciently been looked upon as the assertion of the Unity: and therefore the Son and Holy Ghost but one God with the Father, because both from the Father who is one, and so the ‖ union of them.

* μὴ μοι εἰπε-
τε ὁ θεός
κηρύσσει, πο-
λυθεῖαν κατ-
αγγέλλει. ὁ
θεός, ὁ θεός, ὁ
θεός πατὴρ.
ὁ μὲν ἀρ-
χὴς εἰσαγών
θεός, ὁ θεός κη-
ρύσσει θεούς.
S. Basil. Homil.
26.

In duobus in-
genitis diversa
divinitas inve-
nitur, in uno
autem genito
ex uno ingeni-
to naturalis u-
nitas demon-
stratur. Fulgen.
R. sp. cont. Ar-
rian. ad Obj. 5.
Si quis innasci-

bilem & sine initio dicat Filium, tanquam duo sine principio, & duo innascebiles, & duo innata dicens, duos faciat Deos, Anathema sit. Concil. Sirmi. Deus utique procedens ex Deo secundam personam efficiens, sed non eripiens illud Patri quod unus est Deus. Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus comparatus cum eo qui esset innatus, æquatione in utroque ostensa duos faceret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. Si non genitus esset, collatus cum eo qui genitus non esset, æquales inventi duos Deos merito reddidissent non geniti; atque ideo duos Deos reddidisset Christus, si sine origine esset ut Pater inventus; & ipse principium omnium ut Pater, duo faciens principia, duos ostendisset nobis consequenter & Deos, &c. Novation. de Trin. c. 31.

† ὁ πατήρ ὁ μὲν ἀρχὴ, καὶ κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον θεός.
S. Athan. Orat. 5. προῖτο μὲν ὡς ὁ ἑμὸς λόγος ἢ ὡς μὲν θεός, εἰς ἕν αἴτι-
ον καὶ ἕν καὶ ἀνὴρ πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων. S. Gregor. Naz. Orat. 29. Ὅπου καὶ
μία ὡς ἡ ἀρχὴ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐν μὲν τὸ ἀρχέτυπον, μία ὡς ἡ εἰκὼν, ὁ
τῆς ἐνότητος λόγος ὁ διαθεήσεται. S. Basil. Homil. 26. Patri suo originem

suam debens, discordiam divinitatis de numero duorum Deorum facere non potuit, qui ex illo qui est unus Deus, originem nascendo contraxit. *Novat. c. 31.* Confitemur non deos duos, sed Deum unum, neque per id non & Deum Dei Filium, est enim ex Deo Deus, non innascibiles duos, quia autoritate innascibilitatis Deus unus est. *S. Hilar. de Synod. whose assertion is,* Unum Deum esse ex quo omnia, unam virtutem innascibilem, & unam hanc esse sine initio potestatem, *which words belong unto the Father, and then it followeth of the Son;* Non enim Patri adimitur quod Deus unus est, quia & Filius Deus est. Est enim Deus ex Deo, unus ex uno. Ob id unus Deus, quia ex se Deus. Contra vero non minus per id Filius Deus, quia Pater Deus unus sit. Est enim unigenitus Filius Dei non innascibilis, ut Patri adimat quod Deus unus sit. *de Trin. l. 4.* || φύσις ὅ τοις πατρὶς μία θεὸς ἑνωσις ὅ πατὴρ, ὃς ἔχ' ἡ πρὸς ὃν ἀνὰ τὰ ἐξ ἡς. *Greg. Naz. Orat. 32.* *Unto which words those of Theod. Abucara have relation;* Θεὸς ὅς ἑαυτὸς λέγει, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἑνωσις, ἡτοι ἀνάπτυξις ἡ ἀνακεφαλαιώσις τῆς πατρὸς ὁ πατὴρ ὅτιν, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Θεολόγος. *Opusc. 42.*

From hence it is observed that the name of God, taken
 * ὅθεν οἱ ἀπο- * absolutely, is often in the Scriptures spoken of the Fa-
 τοιοι, ἡ πᾶσα ther: as when we read of *God sending his own Son*; of
 χάριν ἡ ἀγά the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God;
 χαρῇ, ὅταν εἰ- and generally wheresoever Christ is called the Son of
 πῆ, ὁ Θεός, ὡ- God, or the Word of God, the name of God is to be
 τως ἀπολύτως taken particularly for the Father, because he is no Son
 ἡ ἀπερὸς δι- but of the Father. From hence he is stiled *one God, c the*
 εἰς, ἡ ὡς ἑ- true God, *d the only true God, c the † God and Fa-*
 πᾶν (ὡς ἀρ- ther of our Lord Jesus Christ.
 ὄρω, ἡ ὡς εἰς
 ἰδιώματος ὡ-
 ποσατικῶ, τὸν

πατὴρ ἐκ δυνάμεως. *Theod. Abucara, Opusc. 42. a 2 Cor. 13, 14. b 1 Cor. 8. 6. Eph. 4. 6. c 1 Thes. 1. 9. d John 17. 3. e 2 Cor. 1. 3. Eph. 1. 3.* † Unxit te Deus, Deus

tuus. Id enim quod ait, tuus, ad nativitatem refertur; ceterum non perimit natu-
 ram. Et idcirco Deus ejus est, qui ex Deo natus in Deum est. Non tamen per id
 quod Pater Deus est, non & Filius Deus est. Unxit enim te Deus, Deus tuus; de-
 signara videlicet & auctoris sui & ex eo geniti significatione, uno eodemque dicto
 utrumque illum in naturæ ejusdem & dignitatis nuncupatione constituit. *S. Hilar.*
l. 4. Deo enim ex quo omnia sunt Deus nullus est qui sine initio æternus est.
 Filio autem Deus Pater est, ex eo enim Deus natus est. *Id. paulo post.* Cum au-
 tem ex Deo Deus est, per id Deus Pater Deo Filio; & nativitatis ejus Deus est, &
 naturæ Pater, quia Dei nativitas & ex Deo est, & in ea generis est natura qua De-
 us est. *Id. l. 11.* So *S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. 11.* Θεὸς ὁ ἑνωστικός. Θεὸς
 ὁ ἑνωθεὶς. Θεὸς μὲν ἅπ' πάντων. Θεὸν ὃ ἑαυτὸ τὸν πατέρα ἐπηγα-
 γόμενος.

Having

Having thus described the true nature and notion of the divine Paternity, in all the severall degrees and eminencies belonging to it, I may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian understand, what it is he speaks, when he makes his Confession in these words, *I believe in God the Father* : by which I conceive him to expresse thus much.

As I am assured that there is an Infinite and Independent Being, which we call a God, and that it is impossible there should be more Infinities then one : so I assure my self that this one God is the *Father* of all things, especially of all men and Angels, so far as the mere act of creation may be stiled generation ; that he is further yet, and in a more peculiar manner, the *Father* of all those whom he regenerateth by his spirit, whom he adopteth in his Son, as heirs and coheirs with him, whom he crowneth with the reward of an eternal inheritance in the heavens.

But beyond and farre above all this, beside his general offspring, and peculiar people, *to whom he hath given power to become the sons of God* ; I believe him the Father, in a more eminent and transcendent manner, of one singular and proper Son, his own, his beloved, his onely begotten Son ; whom he hath not onely begotten of the blessed Virgin, by the coming of the Holy Ghost, and the overshadowing of his power, not onely sent with speciall authority as the King of Israel, not onely raised from the dead, and made heir of all things in his house ; but antecedently to all this, hath begotten him by way of eternall generation in the same divinity and majesty with himself : by which paternity, coeval to the deity, I acknowledge him alwaies Father, as much as alwaies God.

And in this relation, I professe that eminency and priority, that as he is the Originall cause of all things as created by him, so is he the fountain of the Son begotten of him, and of the Holy Ghost proceeding from him.

I Believe in God the Father ALMIGHTIE.

Revel. 4. 8.

Revel. 19. 6.

After the relation of God's Paternity, immediately followeth the glorious Attribute of his *Omnipotency* that as those in heaven in their Devotions, so we on earth in our Confessions might acknowledge that *Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*; that in our solemn meetings at the Church of God, with the joynt expression and concurring language of the Congregation, we might some way imitate that voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, *Allelujah, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*

* παντοκρ-
τωρ, translated
by Tertul. and
S. Aug. Omni-
tenens, by Pru-
dentius, Omni-
pollens, by all
Omnipotens.

Gen. 2. 1.

Isa. 45. 12.

This notion of *Almighty* in the Creed, must certainly be interpreted according to the sense which the original word beareth in the New Testament: and that cannot be better understood then by the Greek Writers or Interpreters of the Old, especially when the Notion it self belongs unto the Gospel and the Law indifferently. Now the * word which we translate *Almighty*, the most ancient Greek Interpreters used sometimes for the title of God, the Lord of hosts, sometime for his name *Shaddai*, as generally in the book of *Job*: by the first they seem to signifie the Rule and Dominion which God hath over all; by the second, the strength, force, or power by which he is able to perform all things.

The heavens and the earth were finished, saith Moses, and all the host of them: and he which begun them, he which finished them, is the Ruler and Commander of them. Upon the right of Creation doth he justly challenge this dominion. *I have made the earth, and created man upon it, I, even my hands have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded.* and on this dominion or command doth he raise the title of the Lord of hosts; which though preserved in the

* originall

* original language both by S. Paul, and S. James, yet by S. John is turned into that word which we translate Almighty. Wherefore from the use of the sacred Writers, from the † notation of the word in Greek, and from the testimony of the ancient Fathers, we may well ascribe unto God the Father the dominion over all, and the rule and government of all.

* οὐ μὴ κρεί-
ος Σαβαώθ.
ἐγκρατὶς.
λίπν ἡ
μὴν ἀνέμα.
Rom. 9. 29.
the words of
Isa. 1. 9. καὶ αἱ
βασεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ

αὐτῶν ἐς τὰ ὄτα Κρείου Σαβαώθ ἐστὴν ἡ ἀρχὴ. Jam. 5. 4. which are the words of S. James, in relation to Deut. 24. 15. ἄριστος, ἄριστος, ἄριστος κρείος ὁ Θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ. Revel. 4. 8. which were before in Isaiah, ἄριστος, ἄριστος, ἄριστος κρείος Σαβαώθ. Isa. 6. 3.

† that παντοκράτωρ should have the signification of government in it, according to the composition in the Greek Language, no man can doubt, who but one, y considers those vulgar terms of their Politicks, Δημοκρατία, and Δεισποκράτια: from whence it appears that μονοκρατία might as well have been used as μοναρχία; and αὐτοκράτωρ is the proper title given by the Greeks to the Roman Emperour, not onely the later Historians, but even the Coins of Julius Cæsar. Hesych. Αὐτοκράτωρ, αὐτεξέστιος, ἡ κοσμοκράτωρ, because the Roman Emperour was ruler of the known world. and the Devils or Princes of the air are termed by S. Paul κοσμοκράτορες, Eph. 6. 12. which is all one with ἀρχόντες τοῦ κόσμου, as will appear, John 12. 31. 14. 30. 16. 11. As therefore Κράτος signifies of itself rule and authority, Hesych. Κράτος, βασιλεία, ἐξουσία. Κράτος, ἀρχὴ, ἐξουσία to which sense Eustathius hath observed Homer led the following writers by those words of his, --- ὅδ' ἔχ' κράτος αἰὲν ἀΐξειν, Iliad. M. τὸ μὲν κράτος ὑλλάμεινε τὰ τι τοῖς ὕστερον ἢ βασιλείαν κράτος λέγουσι. whence Aeschylus calls Agamemnon and Menelaus διδρόνον κράτος Ἀχαιῶν, and Sophocles after him, δικρατεῖς Ἀρεΐδας. and as κρατεῖν to rule or govern, Κρατεῖν, κρεῖν, ἀρχεῖ from whence Κρατὺς, ἀρχὴν, ἐξουσίαν: So also in composition, παντοκράτωρ, the ruler of all. Παντοκράτωρ, ὁ Θεός, πάντων κρατὺς. Hesych. Παντοκρατορία, πανταρχία. Suid.

‡ Αἰρετικὸι ἐκ οὐδένων ἑνα παντοκράτορα θεόν. παντοκράτωρ γὰρ θεὸν ὁ πάντων κρατὺς, ὁ πάντων ἐξουσιάζων. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τὸν μὲν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς δεσπότην, ἢ τῆς σώματος, ἢ τέλειον λέγουσιν. ὁ γὰρ ψυχῆς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, σώματος ἢ ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; καὶ ὁ δεσπότης σωμάτων, μὴ ἐξουσιάζων ἢ πνευμάτων, πῶς παντοκράτωρ; S. Cyril. Catech. 8. Unus est Dominus Jesus Christus per quem Deus Pater dominatum omnium tenet; unde & sequens secundo omnipotentem pronuntiat Dominum. Omnipotens autem ab eo dicitur, quod omnium teneat potentatum. Ruffin. in Symb.

• ἐξουσία.

Luke 12.5.

Act. 1.7.

Jud. 25.

Revel. 5.13.

† ας ὡς τὸν

κύριον, διαπο-

νήσ.

ἐν ᾧ τὸ κυ-

εῖας καὶ πρῶτος ὢν, ὃ ὢν τῇ χειρὶ πάντας, καὶ ὃς πάντων διαπο-

δύλασται. Phet. Epist. 162.

This authority or power properly potestative is attributed unto God in the * sacred Scriptures, from whence those names or titles which most aptly and fully expresse dominion, are frequently given unto him; and the rule, empire, or government of the world is acknowledged to be wholly in him, as necessarily following that naturall and eternall right of dominion.

What the nature of this authoritative power is, we shall the more clearly understand, if we first divide it into three degrees or branches of it: the first whereof we may conceive, a right of making and framing any thing which he willeth, in any manner as it pleaseth him, according to the absolute freedome of his own will; the second, a right of having and possessing all things so made and framed by him, as his own, properly belonging to him, as to the Lord and master of them, by vertue of direct dominion; the third, a right of using, and disposing all things so in his possession, according to his own pleasure. The first of these we mention onely for the necessity of it, and the dependence of the other two upon it. Gods actuall dominion being no otherwayes necessary, then upon supposition of a precedent act of creation; because nothing, before it hath a being, can belong to any one, neither can any propriety be imagined in that which hath no entity.

But the second branch, or absolute dominion of this *Almighty*, is further to be considered in the Independency and Infinity of it. First it is independent in a double respect, in reference both to the originall, and the use thereof. For God hath received no authority from any, because he hath all power originall y in himself, and hath produced all things by the act of his own will, without any

any commander, counsellor, or coadjutor. Neither doth the use or exercise of this dominion depend upon any one, so as to receive any direction or regulation, or to render any account of the administration of it; as being illimited, absolute, and supreme, and so the fountain from whence all dominion in any other is derived. Wherefore he being the *God of Gods*, is also the *Lord of Lords*, and *King of Kings*, the *only potentate*; because he alone hath all power of himself, and whosoever else hath any, hath it from him, either by donation or permission.

Deut. 10. 17.
Psal. 136. 3.
1 Tim. 6. 15.
μὲνος δυνά-
της. Sap. Syr.
46. 6. ὁ ἰσχυ-
ρος

δυνάτης. 2 Macch. 15. 29. ὁ δυνάτης. 23. δυνάτης ἡς ἐργαζο-
μεθα. 24. ὁ ἰσχυ-
ρος.

The Infinity of Gods Dominion, if we respect the Object, appears in the amplitude or extension; if we look upon the Manner, in the plenitude or perfection; if we consider the Time, in the eternity of duration. The amplitude of the object is sufficiently evidenced by those appellations, which the holy writ ascribeth unto the *Almighty*, calling him the *Lord of heaven*, the *Lord of the whole earth*, the *Lord of heaven and earth*; under which two are comprehended all things both in heaven and earth. This Moses taught the distrustful Israelites in the wilderness. *Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lords thy God, the earth also with all that is there.* in. With these words *David* glorifieth God: *The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine*; so acknowledging his dominion: *as for the world and the fulnesse thereof, thou hast founded them*; so expressing the foundation, or ground of that dominion. and yet more fully at the dedication of the offerings for the building of the temple, to shew that what they gave was of his own, he saith, *Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdome, O Lord,*

Dan. 5. 23.
Jos. 3. 11, 13.
Psal. 97. 5.
Mic. 4. 13.
Zac. 4. 14. 6. 5.
Math. 11. 25.
Acts 17. 24.
Deut. 10. 14.
Psal. 89. 11.

1 Chro. 29. 11, 12.

מושל בכל
ניסמך הכל

L

and

πᾶν τὸ πᾶν
τα τοῖς θεοῖς
ἐποχα, ὁ
πᾶν τὸ πᾶν
τοῖς οἱ θεοῖ
κρατῶσι. Χε-
neph. de exped.
Cyril. l. 2.

and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all. If then we look upon the object of Gods Dominion, it is of that amplitude and extension, that it includeth and comprehendeth all things; so that nothing can be imagined, which is not his, belonging to him as the true owner and proprietor, and subject wholly to his will, as the sole governor and disposer: in respect of which universall power we must confesse him to be *Almighty*.

Jer. 18. 6.

Rom. 9. 21.

If we consider the manner and nature of this Power, the plenitude thereof or perfection will appear: for as in regard of the extension, he hath power over all things; so in respect of the intension, he hath all power over every thing, as being absolute and supreme. This God challenged to himself, when he catechized the prophet *Jeremy* in a potters house, saying, *O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter, saith the Lord? behold, as the clay is in the potters hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel.* That is, God hath as absolute power and dominion over every person, over every nation and kingdome on the earth, as the potter hath over the pot he maketh, or the clay he mouldeth. Thus are we wholly at the disposall of his will, and our present and future condition framed and ordered by his free, but wise, and just decrees. *Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? And can that earth-artificer have a freer power over his brother potsherd, (both being made of the same metal) then God hath over him, who by the strange fecundity of his omnipotent power, first made the clay out of nothing, and then him out of that?*

The duration of Gods dominion must likewise necessarily be eternall, if any thing which is be immortall. For being every thing is therefore his, because it received its being from him, and the continuation of the creature is as much from him as the first production, it followeth that

that so long as it is continued, it must be his, and consequently being some of his creatures are immortall, his dominion must be eternall. Wherefore S. Paul expressly calleth God *the King eternall*, with reference to that of David, *b Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.* And Moses in his Song hath told us, *c the Lord shall reigne for ever and ever*: which phrase *for ever and ever* in the originall signifieth thus much, that there is no time to come assigneable or imaginable, but after and beyond that God shall reigne.

a 1 Tim. 1. 15.

τοῦ βασιλεῦς
ἡς αἰώνων.

b Psal. 145. 13.

מלכות

לְעֹלָמִים

LXX βασι-

λεία πάντων

ἡς αἰώνων.

c Exod. 15. 18.

לְעֹלָמִים LXX ἐπ' αἰῶνα ἡς ἔτι. S. Hier. in seculum & ultra. S. Aquila, Theod. and the Fifth Edit. in Psal. 21. 5. So the LXX. again, Dan. 12. 7. εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας ἡς ἔτι. and Mich. 4. 5. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἡς ἐπ' αἰῶνα.

The third branch of Gods authoritative or potestative power consisteth in the use of all things in his possession, by vertue of his absolute dominion. For it is the generall dictate of reason, that the use, benefit and utility of any thing redoundeth unto him whose it is, and to whom as to the propriator it belongeth. 'Tis true indeed, that God, who is all-sufficient and infinitely happy in and of himself, so that no accession ever could or can be made to his originall felicity, cannot receive any reall benefit and utility from the creature. *d Thou art my Lord*, saith David, *my goodnesse extendeth not to thee.* and therefore our onely and absolute Lord, because his goodnesse extendeth unto us, and not ours to him, because his dominion is for our benefit, not for his own; for us who want, and therefore may receive, not for himself who cannot receive, because he wanteth nothing, whose honour standeth not in his own, but in out *receiving.

d Psal. 16. 2.

Ille nostra servitute non indiget, nos vero dominatione illius indigemus, ut operetur & custodiat nos: & ideo verus & solus est Dominus, quia non illi ad suam, sed ad nostram utilitatem salutemque servimus.

Nam si nobis indigeret, eo ipso non verus

& ipse serviret.

quare? quoniam

bonorum meorum non eges. Ille non eget nostri, nos egemus ipsius; ideo verus

dominus esset, cum per nos ejus adjuvaretur necessitas, sub qua S. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. 1.8. c. 11. Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu, quare? quoniam bonorum meorum non eges. Ille non eget nostri, nos egemus ipsius; ideo verus

dominus. Nam tu non valde verus dominus servi tui; ambo homines, ambo e-
 ges Deo. Si vero putas egre tui servum tuum, ut des panem, eges & tu servi tui,
 ut adjuvet labores tuos. Uterque vestrum altero vestrum indiget: itaque nullus
 vestrum vere dominus, & nullus vestrum vere servus. Audi verum Dominum, cujus
 verus es servus. *Dixi Domino, Deus meus es tu, quare tui dominus? quoniam bo-*
norum meorum non eges Id. ad Psal. 67. * *πάντα ποιεῖται τῷ ἑαυ-*
τῷ & ὡς ἄν' ἐκείνους περιουσιάζων ἀγαθῶν ἀποδοχὴν. Hierocl. in Aurea Carm.
and agam, ὅστις πλεονεξῶν & δεδν ὡς περισσεύμενον, ἕως ἀλήθειαν οἶδμεν *ἑαυτῷ*
τῷ δεῖν εἶναι κρείττονα.

But though the universal cause made all things for the
 benefit of some creatures framed by him, yet hath he
 made them ultimately for himself; and God is as uni-
 versally the finall as the efficient cause of his operations.
 The Apostle hath taught us, that not onely *of him*,
 and *by him*, as the first author; but also *to him*, and *for*
him, as the ultimate end, *are all things*. And 'tis one of
 the proverbiall sentences of Solomon, *The Lord hath*
made all things for himself, yea even the wicked for the
day of evil. For though he cannot receive any real be-
 nefit or utility from the creature, yet he can and doth in
 a manner receive that which hath some similitude or af-
 finity with it. Thus God *rejoyceth* at the effects of his
 wisdom, power and goodnesse, and taketh delight in
 the works of his hands. Thus doth he order and dispose of
 all things unto his own glory, which redoundeth from the
 demonstration of his Attributes.

An explicite belief of this authoritative power and
 absolute dominion of the *Almighty* is necessary, first for
 the breeding in us an awfull reverence of his majesty, and
 entire subjection to his will. For to the highest excel-
 lency the greatest honour, to the supreme authority the
 most exact obedience is no more then duty. If God be
 our absolute Lord, we his servants and vassals, then is
 there a right in him to require of us whatsoever we can
 perform, and an obligation upon us to perform what

* *Ἐμοὶ πόλις*
ἐστὶ καὶ κατοικία
καὶ νόμος
καὶ θεὸς δικαίος
καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν

παντὸς κριτὴς ὁ θεός * *πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτῷ δὲ ἑὴν ἑμὴ.* Servus apud Deum
 lovet

foever he commandeth. Whosoever doth otherwise, while he confesseth, denieth him; while he acknowledgeth him with his tongue, he sets his hand against him. *Why call ye me Lord, Lord, saith our Saviour, and do not the things which I say?* Luke 6. 46.

Secondly, this belief is also necessary to breed in us equanimity and patience in our sufferings, to prevent all murmuring, repining, and objecting against the actions or determinations of God, as knowing that he who is absolute Lord, cannot abuse his power; he whose will is a law to us, cannot do any thing unwisely or unjustly. *Let the potsherd strive with the potshards of the earth; shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, what makest thou? But let the man after God's own heart rather teach us humble and religious silence. I was dumb, saith he, and opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.* When Shimei cast stones at him, and cursed him, let us learn to speak, as he then spake: *The Lord hath said unto him, curse David, who shall then say, wherefore hast thou done so?* Isa. 45. 9. Psal. 39. 10. 2 Sam. 16. 10.

Thirdly, the belief of Gods absolute dominion is yet further necessary to make us truly and sufficiently sensible of the benefits we receive from him, so as by a right value and estimation of them to understand how farre we stand obliged to him. No man can duely prize the blessings of heaven, but he which acknowledgeth they might justly have been denied him: nor can any be sufficiently thankfull for them, except it be confessed that he ought him nothing, who bestowed them.

But as the originall word for *Almighty* is not put onely for the *Lord of Hosts*, but often also for the *Lord Shaddai*: so we must not restrain the signification to the power authoritative, but extend it also to that power which is properly operative and executive. In the title of the *Lord of Sabaoth* we understand the rule and dominion of God, by which he hath a right of governing all: in the name *Shaddai* we apprehend an infinite force and strength,

* So R. 1. So-
lomon will
have it com-
pounded of W
the pronoun,
and 17

שׁוֹשׁ דִּי
בְּאַלְהוּתִי
לְכָל בְּרִיָּה

because in God
there is suffi-
ciency, that is,
sufficient power
over ev'ry
creature; from
whence the
LXX Ruth 1.

20, 21.
Job 21. 15.

31.2. 39. 32.
translate it
ἐκάρδε, as
Symm. Job
22. 3. and
Aquil. with
him, Eze. I. 24.

† לַחַד וְלַחַד
vir, destruxit,
perdidit. from
whence לַחַד
the destroyer ;
and because ut-
ter destruction
requires pow-
er equivalent
to production,
the omni-
potent ; from
whence the
LXX Job 8.3.
translate it ο
παντοκράτωρ.

And this Eryu

* So R1. Solomon will have it compounded of ש the pronoun, and וי ויש באלהותיו לכל בריו because in God there is sufficiency, that is, sufficient power over every creature: from whence the LXX Ruth 1. 20, 21. Job 21. 15. 31. 2. 39. 32. translate it inward, as Symm. Job 22. 3. and Aquil. with him, Ecce. 1. 24. † וי ויִשְׁטוּ ויִשְׁטוּ, destruxit, perdidit. from whence ויִשְׁטוּ the destroyer; and because utter destruction requireth power equivalent to production, the omnipotent: from whence the LXX Job 8. 3. translate it: strength, by which he is able to work and perform all things. For whether we take this word in * composition, as signifying the All-sufficient; whosoever is able to suppetate all things to the sufficing all, must have an infinite power: or whether we deduce it from the † Root denoting vastation or destruction; whosoever can destroy the being of all things, and reduce them unto nothing, must have the same power which originally produced all things out of nothing, and that is infinite. Howsoever, the first notion of *Almighty* necessarily inferreth the second, and the infinity of Gods dominion speaketh him infinitely powerfull in operation. Indeed in earthly dominions, the strength of the Governour is not in himself, but in those whom he governeth: and he is a powerfull Prince, whose subjects are numerous. But the King of Kings hath in himself all power of execution, as well as right of dominion. Were all the force and strength of a nation in the person of the King, as the authority is, obedience would not be arbitrary, nor could rebellion be successfull: whereas experience teacheth us that the most puissant Prince is compelled actually to submit, when the stronger part of his own people hath taken the boldnesse to put a force upon him. But we must not imagine that the Governour of the world ruleth onely over them which are willing to obey, or that any of his creatures may dispute his commands with safety, or cast off his yolk with impunity. And if his dominion be uncontrollable, it is because his power is irresistible. For man is not more inclineable to obey God then man, but God is more powerfull to exact subiection, and to vindicate rebellion. In respect of the infinity and irresistibility of which active power we must acknowledge him *Almighty*; and so according to the most vulgar acception, give the second explication of his || *Omnipotency*.

And this Etymology rather then the former seemeth to be confirmed by the Prophet
But

Isai. 13. 6. Howl ye for the day of the Lord is at hand, : נִוֵּן יְיָוָה כִּשָּׁר It shall come as a destruction from the Almighty (destroyer).

¶ Hoc nisi credamus, periclitatur ipsum nostræ fidei Confessionis initium, qua nos in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem credere confitemur. Neque enim veraciter ob aliud vocatur Omnipotens, nisi quia quicquid vult potest, nec voluntate cujuspiam creaturæ voluntatis omnipotentis impeditur effectus. S. Aug. Enchir. c. 96.

But because this word *Almighty* is twice repeated in the Creed, once in this first Article, and again in the sixth, where Christ is represented *sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty*; and although in our English and the Latin the same word be expressed in both places, yet in the ancient Greek Copies there is a manifest distinction; being the word in the first Article may equally comprehend Gods power in operation, as well as authority in dominion, whereas that in the sixth speaketh onely infinity of power, without relation to authority or dominion: I shall therefore reserve the explication of the later unto its proper place, designing to treat particularly of Gods in finite power where it is most peculiarly expressed; and so conclude briefly with two other interpretations, which some of the Ancients have made of the Originall word, belonging rather to Philosophy then Divinity, though true in both. For some have stretched this word Almighty, according to the Greek notation, to signifie that God holdeth, incircleth, and containeth all things. *Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? who but God? who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure? who but he?* Thus then may he be called Almighty, as holding, containing, and comprehending all things.

Article 1.

μενουμεν ος θεος
ον πατερα
παντοκρατορα
Art. 6. καθε-
λουμεν ος
δεξια δευ-
τατου παντο-
δυνατου.

* As Theophi-
lus Bishop of
Antioch, gi-
ving account
of those words
which are at-
tributed unto
God, as θεος,
καθε-
λουμεν ος
δεξια δευ-
τατου, tells us
he is called
παντοκρατωρ,
οτι αυτος τα
παντα κρατει

καθελουμεν ος. τα δε οντα εν τω ουρανω, κα τα βαθνη των υδατων, κα τα περατα.
tis oikos, ois en ty xeni autu den. Ad Anol. 1. 1. a Prov. 30. 4. b Isa. 40. 12.

* Others

* *as Greg.*

Nyssen. *ἡμῶν
ἐν τῇ Παν-
τοκράτωρ φω-
νῇ ἀκούω-
μεν, τὸ το νο-
ῦμεν, τὸ πᾶσι
τὸ δεῖν ἐν τῷ
εἶναι (σω-
χεῖν; Neither,
saies he, would
God be termed
παντοκράτωρ,
οἱ μὴ πᾶσι ὁ
κτίσις τῷ π-
ειραζοῦντι
αὐτὴν, ὅτι
τῷ εἶναι (σω-
τηροῦντι
ἐδίδετο. contra
Eunom. l. 1.
Creatoris
Omnipotentis,
& omnipo-
tentis atque
omnitenentis
virtus, est causa
subsistendi
omni creaturæ.*

*Quæ virtus ab eis quæ creata sunt regendis si aliquando cessaret, simul & illorum
cessaret species, omnisque natura concideret. S. Aug. in Genes. l. 4. c. 12. & Act. 17.
25, 28. b Wisd. 11. 25. c Neh. 9. 6.*

* Others extend it further yet, beyond that of contain-
ing or comprehension, to a more immediate influence of
sustaining or preservation. For the same power which first
gave being unto all things, continueth the same being un-
to all. * *God giveth to all, life, and breath, and all things.*
In him we live, move and have our being, saith the stran-
gest Philosopher that ever entred *Athens*, the first expo-
sitor of that blind inscription, *To the unknown God.* *b How*
could any thing have endured, if it had not been thy will?
or been preserved, if not called by thee? as the wisdom of
the Jews confesseth. Thus did the Levites stand and bless,
c Thou, even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made heaven;
the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and
all things that are therein, the sea and all that is therein,
and thou preservest them all. Where the continuall con-
servation of the creature is in an equall latitude attributed
unto God with their first production. Because there is
as absolute a necessity of preserving us from returning unto
nothing by annihilation, as there was for first bestowing
an existence on us by creation. And in this sense God is
undoubtedly Almighty, in that he doth sustain, uphold,
and constantly preserve all things in that being which they
have.

From whence we may at last declare, what is couched
under this attribute of God, how farre this Omnipotency
extends it self, and what every Christian is thought to
professe, when he addeth this part of the first Article of
his Creed, *I believe in God the Father ALMIGHTIE.*

As I am perswaded of an infinite and independent es-
sence which I term a God, and of the mystery of an
eternall generation by which that God is a Father: So I
assure my self that Father is not subject to infirmities of

age,

age, nor is there any weaknesse attending on the *Ancient of dayes*; but on the contrary, I believe omnipotency to be an essentiall attribute of his Deity, and that not onely in respect of operative and active power, (concerning which I shall have occasion to expresse my faith hereafter) but also in regard of power authoritative, in which I must acknowledge his antecedent and eternall right of making what, and when, and how he pleased, of possessing whatsoever he maketh by direct dominion, of using and disposing as he pleaseth all things which he so possesseth. This dominion I believe most absolute in respect of its Independency, both in the Originall, and the Use or exercise thereof: this I acknowledge Infinite for amplitude or extension, as being a power over all things without exception; for plenitude or perfection, as being all power over every thing without limitation; for continuance or duration, as being eternall, without end or conclusion. Thus *I believe in God the Father Almighty.*

MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH.

Although this last part of the First Article were not expressed in the * ancient Creeds, yet the sense thereof was delivered in the † first Rules of Faith, and at last these particular words inserted both in the Greek and Latine Confessions. And indeed the work of Creation

* For we finde it not mentioned by S. Augustine de Fide & Symbolo; neither hath

Ruffinus expounded it in the Aquileian, or noted it to be found in the Roman or Orientall Creeds. Leo reciting the three first Articles in his Epistle to Flavianus, maketh no mention of it. Epist. 10. Maximus Taurinensis hath it not in Traditione Symboli, nor Petrus Chrysologus in his Sermons, amongst six severall expositions; no nor in the Homilies of Eusebius Gallicanus, or the Exposition of Venantius Fortunatus. Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra testifies it not at Rome with Julius. Nor did Arius in his Catholick Confession unto Constantine acknowledge it. Neither are the words to be found in the Latine or Greek copy of the Creed written about the beginning of the eighth Century, and published out of the MSS. by the most Reverend and Learned Archbishop of Armagh: or in that which Etherius and Beatus produced against Elipandus Archbishop of Toledo, toward the end of the seventh

Century.

† As in that delivered by Irenæus, οὗς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν ποιητὰ τῶν ὁρατῶν καὶ τῶν ἀορατῶν καὶ τὰς ἀπλάτους, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. *Adv. Hær.* l. 1. c. 2. and that by Tertul. Unum omnino Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit. *de Præscr. adv. Hær.* c. 13. Eusebius delivered the first Article thus in his Confession to the Nicene Council, Πιστεύομεν οὗς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν καὶ ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητὴν. and that Council expressed the same without alteration in their Creed. But after the Nicene Council, we finde added ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, by S. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechisme*, and Epiphanius in *Anchorato*. which addition was received, confirmed, and transmitted to us by the Council of Constantinople. By which means at last we find this Article thus expressed in the *Western Confessions*; Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli & terræ.

most properly followeth the Attribute of Omnipotency, as being the foundation of the first, and the demonstration of the second explication of it. As then we believe there is a *God*, and that *God Almighty*; as we acknowledge that same *God* to be the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in him of us: so we also confesse that the same *God* the *Father* made both *heaven and earth*. For the full explication of which operation, it will be sufficient, first, to declare the latitude of the object, what is comprehended under the termes of *heaven and earth*; secondly, to expresse the nature of the action, the true notion of creation, by which they were made; and thirdly, to demonstrate the Person, to whom this operation is ascribed.

For the first, I suppose it cannot be denied as the sense of the *Creed*, that under the termes of *heaven and earth* are comprehended all things; because the first Rules of Faith did so expresse it, and the most ancient Creeds had either instead of these words, or together with them, *the maker of all things visible and invisible*, which being termes of immediate contradiction, must consequently be of universall comprehension, nor is there any thing imaginable which is not visible or invisible. Being then these were the words of the *Nicene Creed*; being the addition of *heaven & earth* in the *Constantinopolitane* could be no diminution to the former, which they still retained together with them, saying, *I believe in one God the Father Almighty*.

ty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible ; it followeth that they which in the Latine Church made use onely of this last addition, could not chuse but take it in the full latitude of the first expression.

And well may this be taken as the undoubted sense of the Creed, because it is the known language of the Sacred Scriptures. *In six dayes, saith Moses, the Lord made heaven and earth :* in the same time, saith God himself, *the Lord made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.* So that all things by those two must be understood which are contained in them : and we know no Being which is made or placed without them. When God would call a generall rendezvous, and make up an universall Auditory, the Prophet cries out, *Hear O Heavens, and give care O Earth.* When he would expresse the full splendour of his majesty, and utmost extent of his actuall dominion, *Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool.* When he would challenge unto himself those glorious attributes of Immensity and Omnipresence, *Do not I fill heaven and earth ? saith the Lord.* These two then taken together signifie the Universe, or that which is called the World. S. Paul hath given a clear exposition of these words in his explication of the *Athenian Altar.* *God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands.* For being God is necessarily the Lord of all things which he made, the right of his direct dominion being clearly grounded upon the first Creation ; except we should conceive the Apostle to exempt some creature from the authoritative power of God, and so take some work of his hand out of the reach of his arme ; we must confesse that *heaven and earth* are of as large extent and ample signification, as the *world and all things therein.*

Exod. 31. 17.

Exod. 20. 11.

Isa. 1. 2.

Isa. 66. 1.

Jer. 23. 24.

Act. 17. 24.

Where it is yet further observable, that the Apostle hath conjoynd the speech of both Testaments together.

For the ancient *Hebrews* seem to have had no word in use amongst them which singly of it self did signifie the world, as the *Greeks* had, in whose language *S. Paul* did speak; and therefore they used in conjunction the *heaven and earth*, as the * grand extremities within which all things are contained. Nay, if we take the expositions of the later writers in that language, those two words will not onely as extremities comprehend between them, but in the extension of their own significations contain all things in them. For when they divide the Universe into † three worlds, the inferiour, superiour, and the middle world, the lower is wholly contained in the name of *earth*, the other two under the name of *heaven*. Nor do the *Hebrews* onely use this manner of expression, but even the *Greeks* themselves; and that not onely before, but ‖ after * *Pythagoras* had accustomed them to one name. As therefore under the single name of † World or Universe, so also under the conjunctive expression of *heaven and earth*, are contained all things materiall and immateriall, visible and invilible.

* Καλῶς ὃ
πάντες ἔχον
ἐξ ἑξῆς ἁπλοῦς
τοῖς ἀκροῖς,
ἐρανῶ τε καὶ
γῆ, τὰ μέγα
συμπειλη-
φέναι σοιχεῖα.
πῶς ὃ ἀκρο-
φημί; ὅτι γῆ
μὴ τὸ κέντρον
παντὸς ἐμπε-
ριώλητος· καὶ
ἐστὶ κέντρον
μὲν ἀρχῇ
πάντων ἢ γῆ,
πέρα ὃ τέτων
ὃ πάντα περι-
έχον ἑρανός·
τεμπαλὴν ὃ
ἄνωθεν, ἀρχῇ

μὲν ὃ ἑρανός, πέρα ὃ πάντων ἢ γῆ. μετὰ ὃ ἑρανὸς καὶ τῆ γῆς τὰ λοιπὰ τελευ-
τεῖται. Jo. Philop. de Mundi Creat. l. i. c. 5. Τῷ μὲν ἑρανῷ (ὡς μα-
(ἢ οὐσίς) τὸ πᾶν τὸ πάντος ἀπενεμῆται, τὸ ὃ περιέχει τὸ κέντρον. ὃ ὃ σφαῖρα
ἄλλως μὲν τὸ κέντρον ἀρχῇ, ἄλλως ὃ ὃ τὸ περιέχον τὸ ἐπὶ. Hier. act. in Aur. Carm.
† For the Rabbins usually divide the whole frame of things into τὸ μὲν ὡς τὸ πᾶν three
worlds; the first עולם התחתון the inferiour, or עולם השפל the depressed and low-
est world; עולם הזה that is this world, say they to wit, this globe of earth on
which we live. This they divide into three parts; עולם הים the sea, lakes and rivers, עולם
המדבר the desert, solitary and inhabitable places, עולם השמים farre from the ha-
bitations of men, and עולם האדם the earth inhabited. The second is called
עולם הזה the middle or inmost world. עולם העליון, this is the world
of the spheres, containing the acrial region, and the starry heavens. The third is עולם
העליון the superiour world, עולם המלאכים, this is the world of Angels,
עולם אלהים of God, עולם הנפשות of soules, עולם הרוח the spiritual world. Now being
these three comprehend all things imaginable; being the first is sufficiently expressed
in עולם the earth, and the two last in עולם the heavens; it followeth that in the
sense of the Hebrews, heaven and earth signifie all things. ‖ Ets tuis
ἀλλοδαίαισιν, εἰς ὅσον ἔδωκε; ὅς ἑρανὸν τὸ πᾶν καὶ γῆ καὶ μακρόν. * Ποῦς
But

ἡραὶ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπου ἡ δὲ ὅλων πᾶσι καὶ κόσμον, ἐν τῷ ὅντι αὐτῷ τὰ ἑξῆς. *Plat. de Plac. Philosoph. l. 2. c. 1.* † Si Mundum dixeris, illic erit & cœlum, & quæ in eo, sol, & luna, & sideta, & astra, & terra, & freta, & omnis census elementorum. Omnia dixeris, cum id dixeris quod ex omnibus constat. *Tertul. de Virg. Veland. c. 4.* φασὶ δὲ οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ ἑρᾶν καὶ γῆν καὶ θύρας καὶ ἀνθρώπους καὶ κοινὰ καὶ ζωέχον, καὶ φίλιαν, καὶ κοσμιότητα, καὶ ζωοποιῶν, καὶ διγαμοῦν, καὶ τὰ ὅλα τὰ τοιαῦτα διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλεῖσθαι. *Iamb. Protrepr.* but the words are Plato's in Gorgia.

But as the Apostle hath taught us to reason, *When he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him:* So when we say, all things were made by God, it is as manifest that he is excepted who made all things. And then the Proposition is clearly thus delivered; All Beings whatsoever beside God were made. As we read in *S. John* concerning the *Words* that the world was made by him; and in more plain and expresse words before, *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Which is yet further illustrated by *S. Paul:* For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him. If then there be nothing imaginable which is not either in heaven or in earth, nothing which is not either visible or invisible, then is there nothing beside God which was not made by God.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

John 1. 10.

3.

Col. 1. 16.

This then is the unquestionable doctrine of the Christian faith, that the vast capacious frame of the World, and every thing any way contained and existing in it, hath not its essence from, or of it self, nor is of existence absolutely necessary; but what it is, it hath not been, and that being which it hath, was made, framed, and constituted by another. *And as every house is builded by some man;* for we see the Earth bear no such creature of it self; stones do not grow into a wall, or first new, and square,

Heb. 3. 4.

* ὁ αἰδητὸς
ἐπὶ κόσμῳ
ὃ δὲν ἀρα ἀλ-
λοῦσιν ἢ οἶκος
θεῷ. Philo
de Isom.
Κόσμος ἐν-
ταυτῇ καὶ ἐν-
τοιμος, αἰδη-
τὸς οἶκος τοῦ
θεῷ. Id. de
Plant. Noe.

Θεὸν π μὲ-

χδος ὁ κόσμος, καὶ οἶκος θεῷ αἰδητὸς. Id. de Mundi Incorr. 2 Job 26. 7.

† Lucretius calls the Heavens mundi magnum & versatile templum. l. 5. π
ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἰσθὲν θεῷ νομίζον Σύμπαντα καὶ κόσμον εἶναι.
Philo de Monarch.

then unite and fasten themselves together in their gene-
ration, trees sprout not croffe like dry and saplesse beams,
nor do sparres and tiles spring with a naturall uniformity
into a roof, and that out of stone and mortar: these are
not the works of nature, but superstructions and additions
to her, as the supplies of Art, and the testimonies of the
understanding of Man, the great Artificer on earth: So if
the World it self be but an * house, if the earth *which*
hangeth upon nothing, be the foundation, and the glorious
spheres of heaven the roof, if this be the habitation of an
infinite intelligence, the † temple of God; then must we
acknowledge the world was built by him, and conse-
quently, *that he which built all things is God.*

From hence appears the truth of that distinction,
Whatsoever hath any being is either made or not made:
whatsoever is not made, is God; whatsoever is not God, is
made. One uncreated and independent essence, all other
depending on it, and created by it. One of eternall and ne-
cessary existence, all other indifferent, in respect of actuall
existing, either to be or not to be, and that indifferency de-
termined only by the free & voluntary act of the first cause.

Now because to be thus made includes some imper-
fection, and among the parts of the world some are more
glorious then others; if those which are most perfect pre-
suppose a maker, then can we not doubt of a creation
where we find farre lesse perfection. This house of God,
though uniforme, yet is not all of the same materialls,
the footstool and the throne are not of the same mould;
there is a vast difference between the heavenly expansi-
ons. This first aeriall heaven, where God setteth up his
pav-

pavilion, where *he maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind,* is not so farre inferior in place, as it is in glory to the next, the seat of the Sun and Moon, the two great lights, and starres innumerable, farre greater then the one of them. And yet that second heaven is not so farre above the first, as beneath the *third*, into which *S. Paul* was caught. The brightnesse of the Sun doth not so farre surpass the blacknesse of a wandering cloud, as the glory of that heaven of presence surmounts the fading beauty of the starry firmament. For in this great Temple of the world, in which the Son of God is the High Priest, the heaven which we see is but the Veil, and that which is above, the Holy of Holies. This veil indeed is rich and glorious, but one day to be rent, and then to admit us into a farre greater glory, even to the Mercy-seat and Cherubins. For this third heaven is the *proper habitation* of the blessed Angels, which constantly attend upon the throne. And if those most glorious and happy spirits, those *morning starres* which *sang together*; those *sons of God* which *shouted for joy* when *the foundations of the earth were laid*, if they and their habitation were made; then can we no wayes doubt of the production of all other creatures so much inferior unto them.

Psal. 104. 3.

2 Cor. 12. 2.

*Ἰσχυρὸν οἰκιστὴν
πρωτ. Jud. v. 6.*

Job 38. 7.

Forasmuch then as the Angels are termed the *sons of God*, it sufficiently denoteth that they are from him, not of themselves, all filiation inferring some kind of production: And being God hath but one proper and onely-begotten Son, whose propriety and singularity consisteth in this, that he is of the same increated essence with the Father, all other offspring must be made, and consequently even the Angels created sons. Of whom the Scripture speaking saith, *Who maketh his Angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.* For although those words, as first spoken by the Psalmist, do rather expresse the nature of the wind and lightning; yet being the

Psal. 104. 4.

Authour

Amos 4. 12.
Job 28. 26.

Authour of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* hath applied the same to the Angels properly so called, we cannot but conclude upon his Authority, that the same God who created the wind, and made a way for the lightening of the thunder, hath also produced those glorious spirits; and as he furnished them with that activity there expressed, so did he frame the subject of it, their immaterial and immortall essence.

If then the Angels and their proper habitation, the farre most eminent and illustrious parts of the World were made; if to be onely made be one character of imperfection; much more must we acknowledge all things of inferiour nature to have dependance on their universall cause, and consequently this great Universe, or all things to be made, beside that one who made them.

This is the first part of our Christian faith, against some of the ancient Philosophers, who were so wildly fond of those things they see, that they imagined † the Universe to be infinite and eternall, and, what will follow from it, even God himself. 'Tis true that the most ancient of the Heathen were not of this opinion, but * all the Philosophy for many Ages delivered the world to have been made.

† Mundum,
& hoc quod
nomine a-
lio coelum
appellare
libuit, cu-
jus circum-
flexu re-

guntur cuncta, numen esse credi par est æternum, immensum, neque genitum, neque interiturum unquam. *Plin. Natural. Hist. l. 2. c. 1.*

μνον μὲν ἐν ἅπασιν εἶναι φασι, saies Aristotle de Cælo l. 1. c. 10. confesses it the generall opinion, that the World was made. which was so ancient a Tradition of all the first Philosophers, that from Linus, Musæus, Orpheus, Homer, Hesiod and the rest, they all mentioned the Originall of the world, entitling their book Κοσμογονία, or, Θεογονία, or the like. Εἰσὶ γὰρ πῆνες οἱ φασιν ἔδεν ἀγέννητον εἶναι τῆς παραμύτων, ἀλλὰ πάντα γίνεσθαι γονόμενα ὃ τὰ μὲν ἀφ' αὐτῶν διαμένειν, τὰ δὲ πάλιν φθείρεσθαι· μέγιστα μὲν οἱ πρὶ τὸν Ἡσίοδον, ἅτα δὲ τῆς ἄλλων οἱ πρῶτοι φυσιολογῆσαντες, saies Aristotle de Cælo l. 3. c. 1. In which words he manifestly attributes the doctrine of the Creation of the world, not onely to Hesiod, but to all the first naturall Philosophers: which learning beginning with Prometheus the first Professor of that Science, continued in that family amongst the Atlantidae, who all successively delivered that truth. After them the Ionian Philosophy did acknowledge it, and the Italian received it by Pythagoras, whose Scholars

When

all maintained it beside Cœllus Lucanus, the first of them that fancied the world not made, whom Plato though he much esteemed, yet followed not; for there is nothing more evident then that he held the world was made. λέγωμεν δὴ δὴ ἢν αἰτία γενέσθαι καὶ τὸ πᾶν τὸδε ὁ ζῶντας ζῶντων, ἀγαθὸς ἦν. in which words he delivers not onely the generat on of the Universe, but also the true cause thereof, which is the goodnesse of God. For he which asks this plain and clear question, πότερον ἢν αἰετὶς γενέσθαι ἀρχὴν ἔχων ἡ δὲ μὴ, ἢ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πνϑ ἀρξάμεν; and answers the question briefly with a γέγονεν; He which gives this generall rule upon it, τὸ δ' αὖ γενόμενον φημὲν ὑπ' αἰτίας πινδς ἀνάγκην εἶναι ἡγεῖσθαι and then immediately concludes, τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τῶδε τῷ παντὸς εὐεργετὴν καὶ εὐεργετὰ εἰς πάντας ἀδωάτων λέγειν cannot, notwithstanding all the shifts of his Greek expositors, be imagined to have conceived the World not made. And Aristotle, who best understood him, tells us clearly his Opinion ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ, from whence I cited the precedent words, ἐκεῖ γὰρ φησι τὸν ἔρανδον (where by the way o' serve that in Plato's Timæus ἔρανδς and κόσμος are made Synonymous) ἡγεῖσθαι μὲν, ἡ μὲν φασγέτον.

When this tradition of the Creation of the world was delivered in all places down successively by those which seriously considered the frame of all things, and the difference of the most ancient Poets and Philosophers from Moses was onely in the manner of expressing it; those which in after-ages first denied it, made use of very frivolous and inconcluding arguments, grounding their new opinion upon weak foundations.

For that which in the first place they take for granted as an axiome of undoubted truth, that *Whatsoever hath a beginning, must have an end*, and consequently, *whatsoever shall have no end, had no beginning*; is grounded upon no generall reason, but only upon particular observation of such things here below, as from the ordinary way of Generation tend in some space of time unto Corruption. From whence, seeing no tendency to corruption in severall parts of the world, they conclude that it was never generated, nor had any cause or originall of its being. Whereas, if we would speak properly, future existence or non-existence hath no such relation unto the first production. Neither is there any contradiction that at the

N

same

Ocellus Lucanus. ἐπὶ τῆς τῷ παντὸς φύσεως, which book Aristotle hath made use of, and inscribed in many parts.

same time one thing may begin to be, and last but for an hour, another continue for a thousand yeares, a third beginning at the same instant remain for ever : the difference being either in the nature of the things so made, or in the determinations of the will of him that made them. Notwithstanding then their universall rules, which are not true but in some limited particulars, it is most certain the whole world was made, and of it part shall perish, part continue unto all eternitie ; by which something which had a beginning shall have an end, and something not.

The second fallacy which led them to this novelty was the very name of Universe, which comprehendeth in it all things ; from whence they reasoned thus : * If the world or Universe were made, then were all things made ; and if the world shall be dissolved, then all things shall come to nothing : which is impossible. For if all things were made, then must either all, or at least something have made it self, and so have been the cause of it self as of the effect, and the effect of it self as of the cause, and consequently in the same instant both have been and not been ; which is a contradiction. But this fallacy is easily discovered : for when we say the Universe or all things were made, we must be alwaies understood to except him who made all things, neither can we by that name be supposed to comprehend more then the frame of heaven and earth, and all things contained in them ; and so † he which first devised this argument hath himself acknowledged.

Farre more grosse was that third conceit, that if the world were ever made, it must be after the vulgar way in ordinary naturall generations ; in which † two muta-

* τὸ πᾶν γινόμενον ὡς πᾶσι γίνεται καὶ τὸ φθιζόμενον ὡς πᾶσι θοίρεται καὶ οὗτό γε ἀδυνατον· ἀναρχον οὖν καὶ ἀτελεύτητον τὸ πᾶν. Ocellus.
† τὸ δὲ γε ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁνομάζω καὶ σύμπαντα κόσμον, διὰ τὸ οὗτο καὶ τῆς περιουσίας. ἔτι γε, ὅτι καὶ ἀπαιτῶν. ὁ κοσμηθεὶς. Ocellus.

‡ Παρὰ τὸ γενέσθαι ἀρχὴν εἰληφὸς καὶ διαλύσεως ὁφείλον κοινωῆσαι δύο ὅτι δὲ καὶ μεταβολάς· μίαν μὲν πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ μᾶλλον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρότερου ὅτι τὸ βέλτερον· δευτέραν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μᾶλλον ὅτι τὸ μᾶλλον, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βέλτερου ὅτι τὸ χειρότερον. Ἐὰν οὖν καὶ τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν θνητὸν εἴη καὶ φθαρτὸν, θνήσκον ἀπὸ τοῦ μᾶλλον ὅτι τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ χειρότερου ὅτι τὸ βέλτερον. Ocellus.

worse to better; the second from greater to lesse, or from better to worse. The beginning of the first mutation is called generation, the end of it perfection: the beginning of the second is from the same perfection, but concludeth in corruption or dissolution. * But none hath ever yet observed that this frame of the world did ever grow up from lesse to greater, or improve it self from worse to better: nor can we now perceive that it becomes worse or lesse then it was, by which decretion we might guesse at a former encreate, and from a tendency to corruption collect its originall generation. For certainly this Argument proves nothing at all, but onely this (if yet it prove so much) that the whole frame of the world, and the parts thereof which are of greater perfection, were not generated in that manner in which we see some other parts of it are: which certainly no man denies. But that there can be no other way of production beside these petty generations, or that the World was not some other way actually produced, this Argument doth not endeavour to inferre, nor can any other prove it.

The next Foundation upon which they cast off the constant doctrine of their Predecessours, was that generall Assertion, That it is † impossible for any thing to be produced out of nothing, or to be reduced unto nothing: from whence it will inevitably follow, that the matter of this world hath alwaies been, and must alwaies be. The clear refutation of which difficulty requires an explication of the manner how the world was made: the second part before propounded for the exposition of this Article.

Now that the true nature and manner of this Action may be so farre understood as to declare the Christian Faith, and refute the errors of all opposers, it will be necessary to consider it first with reference to the Object or Effect, secondly, in relation to the Cause or Agent, thirdly, with respect unto the Time or Origination of it.

The Action by which the heaven and earth were

*Τὸ δὲ γὰρ ὅλον
καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἔ-
στιν ἡμῶν ἔξ
αὐτῆς παρέχει
τεκμήριον τοῦ
ἔστος· ἔτε γὰρ
γενόμενον αὐτῷ
ἔσθαι, ἔτε
μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ
ἐλάττω καὶ τὸ
μεῖζον μετα-
βάλλον, ἔτε
καὶ ἀνὰ ποτὶς ἢ
μείον γενομέ-
νον· ἀλλ' αὖτε
κατὰ ταύτῃ καὶ
ὡσαύτως δια-
τελεῖ, καὶ ἴσον
καὶ ὅμοιον αὐτῷ
ἑαυτῇ. Ocel-
lus.

† ἀμύχανον γὰρ
τὸ ὅν ὑποτε-
λεῖται ἐκ τοῦ
μὴ ὄντων, ἢ
εἰς τὸ μὴ ὄν
ἀναλυθῆναι.
ἀφ' οὗτος ἀρε-
καὶ ἀνάλειπτον
τὸ πᾶν. Ocel.

* So I conceive
it best expres-
sed by Anselme
Archbishop of
Canterbury.
Dicitur aliquid
esse factum de
nihilō, cum
intelligimus
esse quidem fa-
ctum, sed non
esse aliquid un-
de sit factum.
Monologii. c. 8.
† Creatio apud
nos generatio

vel nativitas dicitur, apud Græcos vero sub nomine creationis verbum facturæ & conditionis accipitur. S. Hieron. ad Eph. 4. ¶ *נָתַן* is promiscuo sly used with *נָתַן*, which is of the greatest latitude, denoting any kind of effectiō, and with *נָתַן*, which rather implies a formation out of something, from whence *נָתַן* a potter. For the first, we read Genes. 2. 3. that God rested from all his work, *וַיָּנַח אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשֹׂת* not that on the sixth day he did the work of two daies, that he might rest on the seventh, as Rabbi Solomon; not that in six daies he made the most of things, that they might afterward produce the like, as Aben Ezra; nor these or any other fancies of the Rabbines; as if *נָתַן* signified one work and *נָתַן* another, for they both expresse the production, as appears clearly in the following verse, These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, *בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ* when they were created, *בְּיוֹם שֶׁבַע* in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth. So Isa. 45. 12. I have made the earth, and created man upon it; where the first expr. shew the proper, the second the improper creation, which indifferēt acception appeareth in collating Psal. 115. 16. 121. 2. with Isa. 45. 5. 45. 18. as also Isa. 47. 7. with Eccl. 12. 1. From whence the Septuagint translate *נָתַן* differently *ποίησιν* or *κτίσειν*. For the second, *נָתַן* is usually rendred by the Targum *נָתַן*, and by the LXX, though generally *κατασκευάσειν*, yet sometimes *κτίσειν*. and that it hath the same signification will appear by conferring Gen. 2. 7. with Isa. 45. 12. and not onely so, but by that single verse Isa. 43. 1. Now thus saith the Lord *נָתַן* thou created thee, O Jacob, *וַיַּצְרֵנִי* and he that formed thee, O Israel. Lastly, all these are joyntly used in the same validity of expression, Isa. 43. 7. Every one that is called by my name, for *נָתַן* I have created him for my glory, *וַיַּצְרֵנִי* I have formed him, yea *וַיַּשְׁכֵּנִי* I have made him.

mously

mouſſly with words which ſignifie any kind of production, or formation, and by it ſelf it ſeldome denotes a production out of nothing, or proper creation, but moſt frequently, the making of one ſubſtance out of another pre-exiſting, as the *a* fiſhes of the water, and *b* man of the duſt of the earth; the *c* renovating or reſtoring any thing to its former perfection, for want of Hebrew words in compoſition; or laſtly, the doing ſome new or wonderfull work, the producing ſome ſtrange and admirable effect, as the *d* opening the mouth of the earth, and the ſignall * judgements on the people of Iſrael.

a as Gen. 1. 21.

b Gen. 1. 27.

2. 7.

c *Pſal.* 51. 12.

Iſa. 65. 17.

d *Numb.* 16. 30.

* *Iſa.* 45. 7.

Creatio atque
conditio nun-

quā nī in magnis operibus nominantur: Verbi cauſa, mundus creatus eſt, urbs condita eſt, domus vero quāvis magis ſit, ædificata potius dicitur, quā condita vel creata. In magnis enim operibus atque facturis verbum creationis aſſumitur. S. Hieron. ad Eph. c. 4.

We muſt not therefore weakly collect the true nature of Creation from the force of any word which by ſome may be thought to expreſſe ſo much, but we muſt collect it from the teſtimony of God the Creatour in his word, and of the world created in our reaſon. The opinion of the Church of the *Jews* will ſufficiently appear in that zealous mother to her ſeventh and youngelt ſon; *I beſeech thee, my ſon, look upon the heaven and the earth, and all that is therein and conſider that God made them of things that were not.* which is a clear deſcription of Creation, that is, production out of nothing. But becauſe this is not by all received as Canonically, we ſhall therefore evince it by the undoubted teſtimony of S. Paul, who expreſſing the nature of Abraham's faith, propoundeth *him whom he believed as God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth thoſe things which be not, as though they were.* For as to be called in the Language of the Scriptures is to be, Behold what manner of love the Father hath beſtowed upon us, that we ſhould be called the ſons of God, ſaith S. John in his Epiſtle, who in his Goſpel told us, he had given us power to become

2 *Maec.* 7. 28.

1 *John* 3. 1.

And as this coeternity of matter opposeth Gods Independency, the proper notion of the Diety, so doth it also contradict his All-sufficiency. For if without the production of something beside himself he cannot make a demonstration of his attributes, or cause any sensibility of his power and will for the illustration of his own glory; and if without something distinct wholly from himself, he cannot produce any thing; then must he * want something externall: and whosoever wanteth any thing is not all-sufficient. And certainly he must have a low opinion and poor conception of the infinite and eternall God, who thinks he is no otherwise known to be Omnipotent then by the † benefit of another. Nor were the Framers of the Creed so wise in prefixing the *Almighty* before *maker of heaven and earth*, if out of a necessity of materiall concurrence, the making of them left a mark of impotency rather then omnipotency.

* Nemo enim non eget eo de cuius utitur; nemo non subicitur ei cuius eget ut possit uti. Sic & nemo de alieno utendo, non minor est eo de cuius utitur; & nemo qui præstat de suo uti, non in hoc superior est eo cui præstat uti. *Tertul. adv. Heret. c. 8.*

† Grande revera beneficium contulit, ut haberet hodie per quem Deus cognosceretur & omnipotens vocaretur: nisi & jam non omnipotens, si non & hoc potens, ex nihilo omnia proferre. *Ibidem.* Quomodo ab homine divina illa vis differet, si, ut homo, sic etiam Deus ope indigeat aliena. Indiget autem si nihil moliri potest, nisi ab altero illi materia ministraretur. *Lactan. l. 2. c. 9.*

The supposition then of an eternall matter is so unnecessary where God works, and so derogatory to the infinity of his power, and all-sufficiency of himself, that the later || Philosophers, something acquainted with the truth which we profess, though rejecting Christianity, have reproved those of the school of *Plato*, who delivered as the doctrine of their Master, an eternall Companion, so injurious to the Father and Maker of all things.

|| Hierocles, καὶ τί μεταλέγω σοι τίς τις, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Πλάτωνι καὶ πινες ἐκ ὁρθῆν ἢ περὶ τῆ δημιουργοῦ διὰ διασώξουσιν ἐννοίας;

ὅτι ἰκανὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι ὥσθ' ἴσως αὐτοτελῶς ὑποσῆται δυνάμει καὶ σοφίᾳ ὅς αἰδῶς ἐνεργῶντα· ἀλλ' ἀγεννήτη ὕλης ζωοργία, καὶ τῇ μὴ παρ' αὐτῷ ὑποστάσει φύσει καταχράμενον, μόνως δημιουργοῦν δυνάμει. *De Provid. & Fato.*

Wherefore

ly contained in him, who hath ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight; but if the most absolute Idea in the Artificers understanding be not sufficient to produce his designe, without hands to work, and materials to make use of, it will follow no more that God is necessarily tied unto preëxisting matter, then that he is really compounded of corporeal parts.

Again, 'tis as incongruous to judge of the production of the world by those parts thereof which we see subject to generation and corruption, and thence to conclude that if it ever had a cause of the being which it hath, it must have been generated in the same manner which they are, and if that cannot be, it must never have been made at all. For nothing is more certain then that this manner of generation cannot possibly have been the first production even of those things which are now generated. We see the Plants grow from a seed; that is their ordinary way of generation: but the first plant could not be so generated, because all seed in the same course of nature is from the preëxisting plant. We see from spawn the fishes, and from eggs the fowls receive now the originall of their being: but this could not at first be so, because both spawn and egge are as naturally from precedent fish and fowl. Indeed because the seed is separable from the body of the plant, and in that separation may long contain within it self a power of germination; because the spawn and egge are sejungeable from the fish and fowl, and yet still retain the prolific power of generation; therefore some might possibly conceive that these seminall bodies might be originally scattered on the earth, out of which the first of all those creatures should arise. But in viviparous Animals, whose offspring is generated within themselves, whose seed by separation from them loseth all its seminall or prolific power, this is not onely improbable, but inconceivable. And therefore being the

* Philosophers themselves confesse, that whereas now all

wisd. 11. 10.

* These words of Aristotle are very observable, in which he disputes against Spen-sippus and the Pythagoreans, who thought the rudiments of things first made, out of which they

grew unto perfection. Ὅσοι δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, ὡς περὶ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ Σπενσίππῳ, τὸ ἀεὶ εἶναι καὶ ἀλλοτρίον μὴ εἶναι ἀρχὴν εἶναι, διὰ τὸ ἐκ τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων τὰς ἀρχὰς αὐτῶν μὴ εἶναι, τὸ δὲ καλὸν καὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐν τοῖς ἐκ τῶν, ἐκ ὁρθῶς οἶον. τὸ δὲ σπέρμα δὲ σπέρων ἐστὶ περὶ τῶν τε

ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν πρῶτων ὡς σπέρμα ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τέλειον ὡς πρῶτων ἀνθρώπων ἀν-
animallē

φαίνεσθαι τὸ ἀπὸ σπέρματος, ὃ δὲ ἐκ τούτου φησὶν ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἕτερον ἐξ ὃ τοῦ σπέρματος.
 By which words Aristotle hath sufficiently destroyed his own Argument, which we produced before out of the first of the *Physics*, and is excellently urged in that Philosophicall piece attributed unto Just. Martyr: Εἰ πρῶτον ὄντι τὸ ἀπὸ σπέρματος, καὶ ὕστερον τὸ ἐκ σπέρματος γινόμενον, καὶ φησὶν ὅτι ἀμφοτέρω. τῇ μὲν φησὶν τὸ κεκμενὸν ἐκ σπέρματος γινόμενον ὑποκεῖν τὸ σπέρμα τῇ δὲ φησὶν τὸ ἀπὸ σπέρματος ὑποκεῖν τὸ σπέρμα ὃ ὄντως ὄν. ἐκ ἀρχῆς τὰ ζῶα καὶ τὰ φυτὰ ἐκ σπέρματος. Arist. *Dogm. Evers.*

animalls are generated by the means of seed, and that the animalls themselves must be at first before the seed proceeding from them; it followeth that there was some way of production antecedent to, and differing from the common way of generation, and consequently, what we see done in this generation can be no certain rule to understand the first production. Being then that universall maxime, that *nothing can be made of nothing*, is merely calculated for the meridian of naturall causes, raised solely out of observation of continuing creatures by successive generation, which could not have been so continued without a being antecedent to all such succession, it is most evident, it can have no place in the production of that antecedent or first being, which we call Creation.

Now when we thus describe the nature of Creation, and under the name of *Heaven and Earth* comprehend all things contained in them, we must distinguish between things created. For some were made immediately out of nothing, by a proper, some onely mediately, as out of something formerly made out of nothing, by an improper kind of Creation. By the first were made all immateriall substances, all the orders of Angels, and the souls of men, the heavens, and the simple or elementall bodies, as the earth, the water, and the aire. *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; so in the beginning, as without any preexisting or antecedent matter: this earth, when so in the beginning made, was without forme and void, covered with waters likewise made not out of it, but with it, the same which, when the waters were gathered together*

Gen. I. 1.

2.

9.

ther unto one place, appeared as dry land. By the second, all the *hosts of the earth*, the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea. Let the earth, said God, bring forth *grasse, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind. Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may flie above the earth.* and more expressly yet; Out of the ground God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air. And well may we grant these plants and animalls to have their origination from such principles, when we read, *God formed man of the dust of the ground;* and said unto him whom he created in his own image, *Dust thou art.*

11.

20.

Gen. 2. 7.

3. 19.

Having thus declared the notion of Creation in respect of those things which were created, the next consideration is of that Action in reference to the Agent who created all things. Him therefore we may look upon first as moved, secondly, as free under that motion, thirdly, as determining under that freedome, and so performing of that action; In the first we may see his goodnesse, in the second his will, in the third his power.

I do not here introduce any externall impulsive cause, as moving God unto the Creation of the world; for I have presupposed all things distinct from him to have been produced out of nothing by him, and consequently to be posteriour not onely to the motion but the actuation of his will. Being then nothing can be antecedent to the creature beside God himself, neither can any thing be a cause of any of his actions but what is in him; we must not look for any thing extrinsecall unto him, but wholly acquiesce in his infinite goodnesse, as the onely moving and impelling cause. *There is none good but one, that is God,* saith our Saviour; none originally, essentially, infinitely, independently good, but he. Whatsoever goodnesse is found in any creature is but by way of emanation from that fountain, whose very being is diffusive, whose

a Mat. 19. 17.

"Αλλο γδ τδ
Θηκ/ητον α;
γαδον, αλλο
τδ καθ' εξιν
αγαδον, αλλο
τδ πρωτος
αγαδον. Pre-
clus in Tima-
um. τδ γ αυ-
τοαγαδον
πρωτος αγα-
δον. Ib.

Gen. i. 31.

* as Plato,
 λέγωμεν ὅ
 δι' ἣν αἰτίαν
 ἡύεσιν καὶ τὸ
 πᾶν τόδε ὁ
 ξυνιστᾶς ξυν-
 ἔστησεν, ἀγα-
 θὸς ἦν ἁγα-
 θῶ δ' ἐλπίς
 περὶ ἐλπίδος
 ἐλπίσι ἐργί-
 νεται φθόνος
 τέτυκτο δ' ἐκ τού-
 τῳ, πᾶντα ὅτι
 μάλιστα ἐβου-
 λήθη ἡυιάσθαι
 καὶ ἀπλήσια

αὐτῷ. ταύτην ὅ ἡυίσιος κόσμου μάλιστα ἄν τις ἀρχὴν κυριωτάτην παρ' ἀνδρῶν
 φρονίμων υποδεχόμενος, ὁρῶντάτα ἀποδέχοιτ' αὐν. in Timæo. Αἰτία γὰρ τῆς ἡ
 πάντων ποιήσεως ἐδεμία ἄλλη πέριςτιν εὐλογος, πλὴν τῆς κατ' εἰσὶαν ἀγαθό-
 τητος. Hierocl. in Aur. Carm. Αἱ γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἀγαθότητα λεγόμεναι αἰτίαι τῆς
 δημιουργίας τῷδε τῷ παντὶ, ἀνθρωπίναις μάλλον περὶσσεύουσιν ἢ τῷ θεῷ ἡ
 πρῶτον. Ib.

† Ἀνάγκη διὰ τὴν τῷ θεῷ ἀγαθότητα ὄντος τῷ κόσμῳ,
 αἰετὶ ἢ δεδν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, καὶ ἢ κόσμον ὑπάρχον ὥστε ἡλίω μὲν καὶ πνεύματι
 ὑφίστασθαι, σάματι ὅ σκιά. Salustius, de Div. et mundo, c. 7. εἰ γὰρ ἀμείνον μὴ
 ποιεῖν, πῶς εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν μετέβηκε; εἰ ὅ τὸ ποιεῖν, τί μὴ ἐξ αἰδίου ἐπαρῆν;
 Hierockes de Fato & Provis. Neither doth he mean any lesse, when in his sense he
 thus describes the First Cause of all things; ἐς αὐν (so I read it, not ἐς, αὐν as the
 Printed Copies, or ἕως αὐν as Curterius) ἢ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτῷ αἰπὸν ἀμετέλλου
 σπῆν καὶ ἀπρῆτον, καὶ ἢ εἰσὶαν τῇ ὁπερὶ αἰετὶ κακῆτιμον, καὶ τὴν ἀγαθότητα
 ἐκ ἐπὶ κτήτων ἔχον, ἀλλ' ἐσιωμένην καθ' αὐτῷ, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν τα πάντα πρὸς τὸ
 εἶναι ὡς αὐτὸν, so I read it, not πάντων πρὸς τὸ εἶναι, as the printed. Hierocl. in
 Aur. Carm. Σωήρητι ὡς αὐτῇ μὲν ἀγαθότητι τῷ πατρὸς ἢ τῆς προνοίας ἐκ-
 νηα. ταύτη ὅ ἢ τῷ δημιουργῷ διακρίνει ποιήσεις· ταύτη ὅ ἢ τῷ παντὶ κατὰ
 ἢ ἀπρῆτον χερόν αἰδιότης. καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ταύτην τε ἀναίρει, καὶ τὴν ἀγα-
 θότητα τε πεποιηκός. Proclus in Timæum. Now although this be the constant
 Argumentation of the later Platonists, yet they found no such deduction or consequence
 in their Master Plato; and I something incline to think, though it may seem very

For

strange, that they received it from the Christians, I mean out of the School of Ammonius at Alexandria; whom though Porphyrius would make an Apostate for the credit of his heathen Gods, yet S. Hierom hath sufficiently assured us that he lived and died in the Christian Faith. The reason of my conjecture is no more then this. Proclus acknowledgeth that Plutarch and others, though with Plato they maintained the goodnesse of God to be the cause of the world, yet withall denied the eternity of it: and when he quotes other Expositors for his own opinion, he produceth none but Porphyrius and Iamblichus, the eldest of which was the Scholar of Plotinus the disciple of Ammonius. And that he was of that opinion, I collect from him who was his Scholar both in Philosophy and Divinity, that is, Origen, whose judgement if it were not elsewhere apparent, is sufficiently known by the Fragment of Methodius, *ἐκ τῆς σχολῆς τοῦ Ἀμμόνιου*, preserved in Photius. *Ὁ δὲ Ὡριγάνης, ὃν κένταυρον καλοῦν, ἔλεγε Σωκράτην εἶναι τὸ μόνον σωφὸν καὶ ἀπεροσθεῖς διὰ τὸ πᾶν.* Being then Porphyrius and Iamblichus cited by Proclus, being Hierocles, Proclus and Salustius were all either ἐκ τῆς σχολῆς γενεῖς, as they called it, that is, descended successively from the School of Ammonius (the great Conciliator of Plato and Aristotle, and Reformer of the ancient Philosophy) or at least contemporary to them that were so; it is most probable they might receive it from his mouth, especially considering that even Origen a Christian confirmed the same.

For the clearing of which ancient mistake we must observe, that as God is essentially and infinitely good without any mixture of deficiency, so is he in respect of all external actions or emanations absolutely free without the least necessity. Those bodies which do act without understanding or preconception of what they do, as the Sun and Fire give light and heat, work alwaies to the utmost of their power, nor are they able at any time to suspend their action. To conceive any such necessity in the divine operations, were to deny all knowledge in God, to reduce him into a condition inferiour to some of the works of his own hands, and to fall under the censure contained in the Psalmist's question, *He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?* Those creatures which are endued with understanding, and consequently with a will, may not onely be necessitated in their actions by a greater power, but also as necessarily be determined by the proposall of an infinite good: whereas neither of these necessities can be acknowledged in God's actions, without supposing a power beside and

Psal. 94, 9, 10.

Eph. i. 11.

above Omnipotency, or a reall happinesse beside and above All-sufficiency. Indeed if God were a necessary agent in the works of Creation, the creatures would be of as necessary being as he is; whereas the necessity of being is the undoubted prerogative of the first Cause. *He worketh all things after the counsell of his own will*, saith the Apostle: and wheresoever counsell is, there is election, or else 'tis vain; where a will, there must be freedome, or else 'tis weak. We cannot imagine that the all-wise God should act or produce any thing but what he determineth to produce; and all his determinations must flow from the immediate principle of his will. If then his determinations be free, as they must be coming from that principle, then must the actions which follow them be also free. Being then the goodness of God is absolutely perfect of it self, being he is in himself infinitely and eternally happy, and this happinesse as little capable of augmentation as of diminution; he cannot be thought to look upon any thing without himself as determining his will to the desire, and necessitating to the production of it. If then we consider Gods goodnesse, he was moved; if his All-sufficiency, he was not necessitated: if we look upon his will, he freely determined; if on his power, by that determination he created the World.

Wherefore that ancient conceit of a necessary emanation of God's goodnesse in the eternall creation of the world will now easily be refuted, if we make a distinction in the equivocall notion of Goodnesse. For if we take it as it signifieth a rectitude and excellency of all vertue and holinesse, with a negation of all things morally evil, vitious, or unholy; so God is absolutely and necessarily good, but if we take it in another sense, as indeed they did which made this Argument, that is rather for beneficence, or communicativeness of some good to others; then God is not necessarily, but freely good, that is to say, profitable and beneficiall. For he had not been in the least de-

gree evil or unjust, if he had never made the world or any part thereof, if he had never communicated any of his perfections by framing any thing beside himself. Every proprietary therefore being accounted master of his own, and thought freely to bestow what ere he gives: much more must that one eternall & independent being be wholly free in the communicating his own perfections without any necessity or obligation: we must then look no further then the determination of Gods will in the creation of the World.

For this is the admirable power of God, that with him to will is to effect, to determine is to performe. So the Elders speak before him that sitteth upon the throne; *Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure* (that is, by thy will) *they are and were created.* Where there is no resistance in the object, where no need of preparation, application, or instrumentall advantage in the agent, there the actuall determination of the will is a sufficient production. thus God did make the heavens and the earth by * willing them to be. This was his first command unto the creatures, and their existence was their first obedience. † *Let there be light*, this is the injunction; *and there was light*, that's the creation. Which two are so intimately and immediately the same, that though in our and || other translations those words *let there be*, which expresse the command of God, differ from the other, *there was*, which denote the present existence of the creature; yet in the Originall there is no difference at all, neither in point nor letter. And yet even in the diversity of the Translation the phrase seems so expressive of Gods infinite power, and immediate efficacy of his will, that it hath raised some admiration of *Moses* in the * enemies of the

Revel. 4. 11.

* So Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of God. *Ψιλῶ τὸ βέλους δημιουργεῖ, καὶ τὸ μόνον ἐδελήσκει αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὸ γενέσθαι. Πρωτερε, † γενεθῆτω φῶς, καὶ τὸ πλάσμα ἔργον ἦν.* S. Basil. *ὅταν ὁ φωνῇ θεῷ, καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ πλάσμα λέγωμεν, τὴν*

ἐν τῷ δελήματι ῥοπήν ἡγούμεθα ἐν ᾧ δὲ πλάσματος χειραγώγεσθαι. Id. in Hexaem. || *as γενεθῆτω φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. Fiat lux, & facta est lux. or as Aquila, γενέσθω, καὶ ἐγένετο.* as Symmachus, *ἔστω, καὶ ἐγένετο.* all with a difference: where as in the Hebrew it is a most expressive and significant tautology, *וַיֵּן וַיֵּן וַיֵּן*. * As Dionysius Longinus, *πειρῶν ὁ ψυχοφάνης, 7. Τὸν καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰουδαίων θεομοβέτης, religion*

ἔχ' οὐχὺν ἀνὴρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τῷ θεῷ δωάμεν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐργάσει καὶ ἐ-
φηνεν, εὐθύς ἐν τῇ εἰς ὁλὴν γράφει τῷ νόμῳ, ἔπειν ὁ θεός, φησί· τί; ἡμεῖς
φῶς, καὶ ἐγένετο· ἡμεῖς γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο. *where observe Longinus made use of the
Translation of Aquila.*

* Πάντα ὅσα religion both of the Jews and Christians. * *God is in the
ἡθέλησεν ἐποι- heavens; he hath done whatsoever he pleased, saith David;
ἦσαν ἐν τῷ ἔ- yea in the making of the heavens, he therefore created
ργᾶν καὶ ἐν τῇ them because he pleased; nay more, he thereby created
γῇ. ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐ- them, even by willing their creation.
χέ περὶ τῷ δι-
μιουργίαν τῷ
ἐν τῇ γῇ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῷ κτίσιν τῷ ἄνω δωάμενον ἤρξατο ἡ θέλησις
αὐτοῦ μόνον. S. Chrys. 1. περὶ τοῦ ἀνταλήπτου.*

Heb. 11. 3.

*Prov. 8. 22,
23.*

John 17. 5.

Now although some may conceive the Creature might have been produced from all eternity by the free determination of Gods will, and it is so farre certainly true, that there is no instant assignable before which God could not have made the world; yet as this is an Article of our faith, we are bound to believe the heavens and earth are not eternall. *Through faith we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God.* and by that faith we are assured, that whatsoever possibility of an eternall existence of the creature may be imagined, actually it had a temporall beginning; and therefore all the arguments for this world's eternity are nothing but so many erroneous misconceptions. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old,* saith Wisedome. *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.* And the same Wisedome of God being made man reflecteth upon the same priority, saying, *Now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* Yea in the same Christ are we blessed with all spirituall blessings, according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world. The impossibility of the origination of a circular motion, which we are sure is either in the heaven or earth

earth, and the impropriety of the beginning of time, are so poor exceptions, that they deserve not the least labour of refutation. The actual eternity of this world is so farre from being necessary, that it is of it self most improbable, and without the infallible certainty of Faith there is no single person carries more evidences of his youth, then the world of its * novelty.

* as even Lucretius confesseth, and that out of the

Principles of Epicurus.

Verum, ut opinor, habet novitatem summa, recensque Natura est mundi, neque pridem exordia cepit.

'Tis true indeed, some ancient accounts there are which would perswade us to imagine a strange antiquity of the world, farre beyond the annals of *Moses*, and account of the same spirit which made it. The † *Egyptian* Priests pretended an exact Chronology for some myriads of years, and the *Chaldeans* or ‖ *Assyrians* farre out-reckon them, in which they delivered not onely a Catalogue of their Kings, but also a table of the * Eclipses of the Sun and Moon.

† Plato tells us of an account which an Egyptian Priest gave to Solon, in which the Athenians were 9000 years old, and those of Sais 8000. περτέ-
σαν μὲν τὴν

παρ' ὑμῖν ἔτασι χιλίοις ὅκτ' ἡν τὴν ἡμετέραν τὸ σπέρμα παρλαβόντων ὑμῶν. τὴν δὲ ὑστερον τῆς δεκάτης διακοσμίας παρ' ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γεγραμῶσιν ὀκτακχιλίων ἐστὶν αἰώνος γέγραπται. in Timæo. Pomponius Mela makes a larger account out of Herodorus. Ipse vetustissimi (ut prædicant) hominum trecentos & triginta reges ante Amasim, & supra tredecim millium annorum ætates certis Annalibus; where, as the Egyptians much stretch the truth, so doth Mela stretch the relation of Herodorus, who makes it not 13000, but 11340 years. Diodorus Siculus tells us of 23000 years from the reign of the first King of Egypt to the expedition of Alexander, and Diogenes Laertius out of other Authours more then doubles that account. Αἰγυπτῖοι μὲν γὰρ Νοῦν γυνάδ' παῖδα Ἡρακλῆον ὃν ἀρξαι φιλοσοφίας, ἧς τὲς περὶ τὰς ἱερίας εἶναι καὶ ποροφίαν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς Ἀλέξανδρον τὴν Μακεδονίαν εἶναι μυριάδας τέσσαρας καὶ ὀκτακχιλίας ὀκτακοσίων ἐπὶ ἑξήκοντα τρεῖς. Ἄστυνιοι δὲ φησὶν Ἰάμβελιχος, ὅτι ἐπὶ αὐτῶν καὶ εἰκοσι μυριάδας ἐπὶ μόναν ἐτίθηγε, φησὶν Ἰππαρχος· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλας ἀποκαταστάσεις καὶ περιόδους αὐτῶν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν κοσμοκράτῶν μνήμη παρέδοκε. Proclus in Timæum. * ἐν οἷς ἡλίμην ἐκλείψει γυνάδ' τετρακοσίων ἐβδμήκοντα τρεῖς, σελήνης δὲ ὀκτακοσίων τετρακόντα δύο. Diog. Laert.

P

But

But for their number of years nothing is more certain than their forgery, for the *Egyptians* did preserve the antiquities of other Nations as well as their own, and by the evident fallacy in others have betrayed their own vanity. When *Alexander* entred *Egypt* with his victorious army, the Priests could shew him out of their sacred Histories an account of the *Persian* Empire, which he had gained by conquest, and the *Macedonian*, which he received by birth, of each for * 8000 years: whereas nothing can be more certain out of the best Historicall account, then that the *Persian* Empire, whether begun in *Cyrus* or in *Medus*, was not then 300 years old, and the *Macedonian*, begun in *Coranus*, not 500. They then which made so large additions to advance the antiquity of other Nations, and were so bold as to present them to those which so easily might refute them (had they not delighted to be deceived to their own advantage, and took much pleasure in an honourable cheat) may without any breach of charity be suspected to have extended the Account much higher for the honour of their own Countrey. Beside, their Catalogues must needs be ridiculously incredible, when the *Egyptians* make their first Kings reigns above † 1200 years apiece, and the *Assyrians* theirs above 30000; which forced after-ages to take their yeares for moneths, and these for daies.

* This fallacy appears by an Epistle which Alexander wrote to his mother Olympia, mentioned by Athenagoras, Minutius Felix, S. Cyprian, and S. Augustine. *Persarum autem & Macedonum imperium usque ad ipsum Alexandrum cui loquebatur, plusquam octo millium annorum ille constituit; cum apud Græcos*

Macedonum usque ad mortem Alexandri quadringenti octoginta quinque reperiantur anni, Persarum vero, donec ipsius Alexandri victoria finirentur, ducenti & triginta tres computentur. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 12. c. 10.

† as Diodorus Siculus takes notice of the *Egyptians*, and Abydenus of the *Chaldeans*, whose first Kings reigned 120 Savi. ὅς τις πάλαι εἶναι βασιλεῖς λέγει· ὃν ὁ Χαλδαῖος βασιλεὺς ὧν ἔζησε λέγει ἐκ τὸν αἶον. Now this word *Chaldeos* was proper in the Babylonian or Chaldean account. Helyc. Σάδερ, ἀειθεὶς τις παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων. but what this number was he tells us not. In the Fragment of Abydenus preserved by Eusebius, Σάδερ δὲ ἔσιν ἐξαχθσία καὶ περὶ ἑλίας ἔτη, every Σάδερ is 3600 years. and consequently the 120 Σάδερ belonging to the reign of the first Kings 432000 years. Neither was this the account onely of Abydenus, but also of Berosus; neither was the interpretation onely of Eusebius, but also of Alexander

And

Polyhistor, who lik wise expresseth ἡ γένεσις τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ. Cæus ἐκ τῆς ἡκοσι, ἢ περὶ μυριάδας πτωρχόντα τρεῖς καὶ δύο χιλιάδας. This seemed so high'y incredible, that two ancient Monks, Anianus and Panodorus, interpreted those Chaldean years to be but daies, so that every Cæus should consist of 3600 daies, that is 9 yeares 10 moneths and a half, and the whole 120 Cæus for the 10 Kings 1183 yeares 6 moneths and odd dayes. This is all which Jos. Scaliger or Jacobus Goar of late cou'd find concerning this Chaldean Computation: and the first of these complains that none but Helychius makes mention of this account. I shall therefore supply them not onely with another Authour, but also with a diverse and distinct interpretation. Σάεσι μέτερον, καὶ δευμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις. οἱ γὰρ οἱ Cæus ποιῶσιν ἐνιαυτὸς βσκη', οἱ γίνονται ἐν ἐνιαυτοῖς καὶ μῆνες ἑξ. that is, according to the Translation of Portus, Sari apud Chaldaeos est mensura & numerus. Nam 120 Sari faciunt anno 2222, qui sunt anni 18 & sex menses. well might he fix his N. L. or non liquet to these words; for as they are in th. printed books there is no sense to be made of them; but by the help of the MS. in the Vatican Library we shall both supply the defect in Suidas, and find a third valuation of the σάεσι. Thus then that MS. represents the words. Οἱ γὰρ οἱ Cæus ποιῶσιν ἐνιαυτὸς βσκη' κατὰ ἡ Χαλδαίων ἡρόν, εἴ ποὺ ὁ Cæus ποιεῖ μῆνας Cεληνιακῶν σκηβ', οἱ γίνονται ἐν ἐνιαυτοῖς καὶ μῆνες ἑξ. And so the sense is clear. Σάεσι according to the Chaldee account comprehends 222 moneths, which come to 18 yeares and six moneths; therefore 120 σάεσι make 2220 yeares, and therefore for βσκηβ', I read, leaving out the last β, σκη'.

And for the calculation of Eclipses, as it may be made for many thousand yeares to come, and be exactly true, and yet the world may end to morrow, because the calculation must be made with this tacite condition, if the bodies of the Earth, and Sun, and Moon do continue in their substance and constant motion so long; So may it also be made for many millions of yeares past, and all be true, if the world have been so old, which the calculating doth not prove, but suppose. He then which should in the Egyptian Temples see the description of so many Eclipses of the Sun and Moon, could not be assured that they were all taken from reall observation, when they might be as well described out of prolepticall supposition.

Beside, the motions of the Sun, which they mention together and with authority equall to that of their other obliervations, are so incredible and palpably fabulous, that they take off all credit and esteem from the rest of their narrations. For with this wild account of yeares, and

* ΕΥ ΤΟΙΟΥΤ
 ΤΕΤΡΑ ΠΩΣ
 ΝΟΤΕΡΑΙΣ
 ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΟΤΙ Η-
 ΔΙΩΝ ΤΗΛΙΩΝ
 ΑΝΑΓΕΙΛΑΙ *

ΕΙΣ ΔΑ ΤΕ ΝΥΝ ΚΑΤΑΔΙΝΕΤΑΙ, ΟΥΔΕΥΤΕΝ ΔΙΣ ΕΠΑΡΤΕΙΛΑΙ * ΕΥ ΔΕ ΝΥΝ ΑΝΤΙΛΛΕΙ, ΟΥΘΑΥ-
 ΤΑ ΔΙΣ ΚΑΤΑΕΙΝΑΙ. Herod. Euterpe. Mandatumque literis servant, dum *Θε-
 γυπτι* sunt, quare cuius suos vertisse sidera, ac solem his jam occidisse ubi nunt
 oitur. *Mela* l. I. c. 9.

seemingly accurate observations of the heavens, they left
 it written to posterity ; that the whole course of the celesti-
 all motions were four times changed : so that * the Sun
 hath twice risen in the East, and set in the West, as now it
 does ; and on the contrary, twice risen in the West, and set
 in the East.

What then are these feigned observations and fabulous
 descriptions for the worlds antiquity, in respect not onely
 of the infallible Annals of the Spirit of God, but even of
 the constant testimonies of more sober men, and the
 reall apparences and face of things, which speak them
 of a farre shorter date ?

If we look into the Historians which give account of
 ancient times, nay, if we peruse the fictions of the Poets, we
 shall find the first to have no footsteps, the last to feign no
 actions, of so great antiquity. † If the race of men had
 been eternall, or as old as the *Egyptians* and the *Chaldees*
 fancy it ; how should it come to passe that the Poeticall
 inventions should find no actions worthy their Heroick
 verse before the *Trojan* or the *Theban* warre, or that great
 adventure of the *Argonauts* ? For what soever all the
 Muses, the daughters of Memory, could rehearse before
 those times, is nothing but the Creation of the world, and
 the nativity of their Gods.

† This Argu-
 ment is there-
 fore to me the
 stronger, be-
 cause made
 by him
 who cannot
 be thought
 a favourer of
 our Religion,
 because he
 was a countenancer of none, Epicurus. whose mind is thus delivered by *Lu-
 cretius*, l. 5.

was a countenancer of none, Epicurus. whose mind is thus delivered by *Lu-
 cretius*, l. 5.

Præterea, si nulla fuit genitalis origo
 Terrarum & cœli, semperque æterna fuere ;
 Cur supra bellum Thebanum & funera Trojæ,
 Non alias alii quoque res cecinere Poetæ ?
 Quo tot sæcla virum toties cecidere ? neque usquam
 Æternis famæ monumentis insita florent ?

If we * consider the necessities of life, the wayes of freedom and commerce amongst men, and the inventions of all arts and sciences, the letters which we use, and languages which we speak; they have all known originals, and may be traced to their first Authors. And the first beginnings were then so known and acknowledged by all, that the inventers and authours of them were reckoned amongst their Gods, and worshipped by those to whom they had been so highly beneficiall. which honour and adoration they could not have obtained, but from such as were really sensible of their former want, and had experience of a present advantage by their means.

* Pliny gives a large account of these, l. 7. c. 56. and Lucetius makes use of this Argument, l. 5.

Quare etiam quædam nunc artes expoliuntur,

Nunc etiam augescunt, nunc addita navigiis sunt

Multa, modo organici melicos peperere sonores :
Denique natura hæc rerum, ratioque reperta est
Nuper, & hanc primus comprimis ipse repertus
Nunc ego sum in patrias qui possum vertere voces.

If we search into the Nations themselves, we shall see none without some originall : and were those † Authours extant which have written of the first plantations and migrations of people, the foundations and inhabiting of Cities and Countries, their first rudiments would appear as evident, as their later growth and present condition. We know what waies within 2000 years people have made through vast and thick woods for their habitations, now as fertile, as populous as any. The *Hercynian* trees, in the time of the *Cæsars*, occupying so great a space, as to take up a journey of 60 dayes, were thought even then * co-evall with the world. We read without any shew of con-

† I mean, not only such as wrote the building of particular Cities, as Apollonius Rhodius, Καὶνὴ κτίσιν, Xenophanes Σαλαμῖνος κτίσιν, Crito Συεγκυσῶν κτίσιν, and Philochorus Σαλαμῶν.

κτίσιν : but those more generall, as Polemo Κτίσεις πόλεων ἐν Φωκίᾳ, Charon Πόλεων κτίσεις, Callimachus Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων, Hellanicus Κτίσεις ἰθύνων καὶ πόλεων, and the Indefinite Κτίσεις written by Dercyllus, Dionysius, Hippys, Trisimachus, and others.

¶ Sylvæ, Hercynia dierum sexaginta iter occupans, ut major aliis, ita & notior. *Mela* l. 3. c. 3. * *Hercynia* sylvæ roborum, vastitas intacta ævis & congenita mundo, prope immortalis sorte miracula excedit. *Plin.* l. 16. c. 2.

tradition, how this Western part of the world hath been peopled from the East; and all the pretence of the *Babylonian* antiquity is nothing else, but that we all came from thence. Those eight persons saved in the Ark, descending from the *Gordiean* mountains, and multiplying to a large collection in the plain of *Sinaar*, made their first division at that place: and that dispersion or rather dissemination hath peopled all other parts of the world, either never before inhabited, or dispeopled by the Flood.

These Arguments have alwaies seemed so clear and undeniable, that they have put not onely those who make the world eternall, but them also who confesse it made, but farre more ancient then we believe it, to a strange answer, to themselves uncertain, to us irrationall.

For to this they replied, That this World hath suffered many alterations, by the utter destructions of nations and depopulations of Countries, by which all monuments of antiquity were defaced, all arts and sciences utterly lost, all fair and stately fabricks ruined, and so mankind reduced to paucity, and the world often again returned into its infancy. This they conceived to have been done oftentimes in severall ages, sometimes by a deluge of water, sometimes by a torrent of fire; and lest any of the elements might be thought not to conspire to the destruction of mankind, the air must sweep away whole Empires at once, with infectious plagues, and Earthquakes swallow up all ancient cities, and bury even the very ruines of them. By which answer of theirs they plainly afford two great advantages to the Christian Faith. First, because they manifestly shew that they had an universall tradition of Noahs flood, and the overthrow of the old world: Secondly, because it was evident to them that there was no

Thus Ocellus, who maintained the world was never made, answers the Argument brought from the Greek Histories which began with Inachus, as the first subject, not author of History (as N. Garola in his Annotations mistakes Ocellus) Διὸ καὶ τοῖς λέγουσι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ιστορίας ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Ἰνὰ χυεῖναι τὸ Ἀργεῖον, προσκρίνον ὅπως ἔχῃ ὡς ἀπὸ πνέου ἀρχὴς πάντων, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἀπολλωνίου μεταβολῆς κατ' αὐτήν. So that he will have Inachus to be the first not absolutely, but since the last great alteration made in Greece: and then he concludes that Greece hath often been, and will often be barbarous, and lose the memory

way

of all their actions, Πολλὰ κ' ἔχουσιν καὶ ἔτι βάρβαροι ἢ Ἕλληνες, ἔχουσιν αὐτῶν μόνον νομοὶν μετέσταντο, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως ἐμύζοντες ἔτι μοῖσι αὐτῆς νομοῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεωτέραι αἰεὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀρχὴν λαμβάνουσιν. Ocellus de Universe, c. 3. Thus Plato, who asserted the creation of the world, but either from eternity, or such antiquity as does not much differ from it, brings in Solon inquiring the age of the Greek Histories, as of Phoroneus and Nicobe, Deucalion and Pyrrha; and an Egyptian Priest answering, that all the Greeks were boies, and not an old man amongst them, that is, they had no ancient monuments, or history of any antiquity, but rested contented with the knowledge of the time since the last great mutation of their own countrey. πολλὰ καὶ πολλὰ φθορὰ γένεσιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ θανάτοις, πλεῖν μὲν καὶ ἵδαν μέγισται, μύησις δ' ἄλλοις ἔτερας βραχύτεραι. in Timæo. And Lucretius the Epicurean, who thought the world but few thousand years old, as we believe, and that it should at last be consumed, as we also are persuaded; thinks this Answer of theirs so farre from being a refutation of the former, that he admits it as a confirmation of the later part of his opinion. De rerum natura l. 5.

Quod si forte fuisse antehac eadem omnia credis,
Sed periisse hominum torrenti læta vapore,
Aut cecidisse urbis magno vexamine mundi,
Aut ex imbris assiduis exisse rapaces
Per terras amnes atque oppida cooperuisse:
Tanto quippe magis victus fateare necesse est,
Exitium quoque terrarum cœlique futurum.

way to salve the eternity or antiquity of the world, or to answer this argument drawn from history and the appearances of things themselves, but by supposing innumerable deluges and deflagrations. Which being merely feigned in themselves, not proved, and that first by them which say they are not subject themselves unto them, as the Egyptians did, who by the advantage of their peculiar situation feared neither perishing by fire nor water; serve onely for a confirmation of Noah's Flood so many ages past, and the surer expectation of S. Peter's fire, we know not how soon to come.

* So that Egyptian Priest in Plato's Timæus tells Solon, that the Fable of Phaethon did signify a real conflagration of the world; but so as all they which lived in mountains or drie parts of the

earth were scorched and consumed, but of th^e so which lived near the seas or rivers, in the valleys, some were preserved. ἡμῶν δ' αὖτε, οὐ Νῶα καὶ εἰς ταῖς ὁμήροις, καὶ τὰς ἐν ταύταις τῆς ἀπορίας σωζόμενοι. Thus the Egyptians pretend Nilus saved them from the flames of Phaethon. Nor were they onely safe from conflagrations, but from inundations also. For when in Greece, or other parts a deluge happens, then

It

all their cities were swept away into the Sea: κατὰ τὴν δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν, saies the Priest, ἔτε τότε, ἔτε ἄλλοτε ἀνῶθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρούρας ὅσας ὁπρὸν τὸ δ' ἐναντίον κατῶθεν ἐπαιέναι πύουεν· ὅθεν καὶ δι' αἷς αἰτίας τ' αὐτῶν τὸ σωζόμενα λέγει παλαιότατα. So Egypt receiving not their waters from above by clouds, but from below by springs filling the river Nile, was out of danger in a Deluge, and thereby preserved the most ancient monuments and records. But alas, this is a poor shift to them which believe that in the great and universall Flood, all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, Gen. 7. 11.

It remaineth then that we stedfastly believe, not onely that the *heavens and earth and all the host of them* were made, and so acknowledge a Creation, or an actuall and immediate dependence of all things on God; but also that all things were created by the hand of God, in the same manner, and at the same time, which are delivered unto us in the books of *Moses* by the Spirit of God, and so acknowledge a novity, or no long existence of the Creature.

* So Cicero indeed speaks, innumerabilia secula, in his book of Divination. ; and Socrates in Plato's Theæretus brings this argument against the pride of great and noble families, that they which mention a succession of their Ancestors which have been rich and

powerfull, do it merely ὡς ἀπαυδυσίαι, ἢ δωμαμένων εἰς τὸ πᾶν αἰεὶ βλέπειν, ὡς λογίζεσθαι, ὅτι πάππων καὶ περγόνων μυριάδες ἐκείνῳ γερύνασιν ἀναείθμητοι, ὡς αἰεὶ πλείοι καὶ πτωχοί, καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ δούλοι, βάρβαροι τε καὶ Ἕλληνες πολλὰς μυρίους γερύνασιν ὁτῶρον. as if every person were equally honourable, having innumerable ancestors rich and poor, servants and kings, learned and barbarous.

genera-

generations of men past, though * *Origen* did fondly seem to collect so much by some misinterpretations of the Scriptures; yet if we take a sober view, and make but rational collections from the Chronology of the sacred writ, we shall find no mans pedigree very exorbitant, or in his line of generation descent of many score.

* *Origen* did not only collect the eternitie of the world from the coexistence of all Gods attributes, as because he is

παντοκράτωρ, and δημιουργός, therefore he was alwaies so, (for how could he be δημιουργός άνευ δημιουργημάτων, or παντοκράτωρ άνευ τῆς χρηματικῆς αἰῶνος) but also from the 90 Psalm; From everlasting to everlasting thou art God. For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday, and that at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus; Who can number the sand of the sea, and the drops of the rain, and the daies of eternity? But Methodius, Bishop and Martyr, hath well concluded that disputatiō. Ταῦτα φησὶν ὁ Ὠριγῆνης σπυδίζων, καὶ ὁ ἐξ οὐρα πάλιν.

When the age of man was long, in the infancy of the world, we find ten generations extend to 1656 years, according to the shortest, which is the best account. From the Flood, brought at that time upon the earth for the sins of men which polluted it, there have not passed for certain 4000 years. Now by the experience of our families which for their honour and greatnesse have been preserved, by the genealogies delivered in the sacred Scriptures, and thought necessary to be presented to us by the blessed Evangelists, by the observation and concurrent judgement of former ages, three † generations usually take up a hundred years. If then it be not yet 4000 years since the universall deluge, as certainly it is not, if all men which are or have been since have descended from *Noah*, as undoubtedly they have, if he were but the tenth from *Adam*, as *Moses* hath assured us; then is it not probable that any person now alive is above a hundred and thirty generations removed from *Adam*. Thus having expressed at last the time, so farre as it is necessary to be known, I shall conclude this second Consideration of the nature and notion of Creation.

† by the Greeks called γενεαί, which are successions of generations from father to son; as in S. Mat. I. 17. Indeed sometimes they take it for other spaces of time, as Artemidorus observes for 7 years. Κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν μὲν ἔτη ζ'. ὅθεν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ ἱατροὶ, ὅτι δύο γενεαὶ (not πρὸς 7, as Wolfius and Porcus would correct it) καὶ δέκα (not μὲν δέκα, as Suidas

das) φασὶν ὅτι τρεῖς γενεαὶ καὶ δέκα (not τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, as Suidas

Now

Q

transcribing him negligently) λέγοντας. Sometimes they interpret it 20.25. or 30 Years, as appears by Hesychius. And by that last account they reckoned the years of Nestor. κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἢ λ'. ὅθεν καὶ Νέστορα βύλον εἰς ὀνενήκοντα ἔτη γεγονέναι. so Artemidorus and the Grammarians. Although I cannot imagine that to be the sense of Homer Ἰλ'. α.

Τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γυναι μερόπων ἀνδρώπων
Ἐφθιάθ' οἱ οἱ περίθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ' ἐχρίοντο.

And I conceive that glosse in Hesychius, ἐπὶ διασημάτων χρόνων ἢ μὴ κατ' αὐτὸ βεβιωκότων, to be farre more properly applicable to that place. But in the sense of which now we speak it is taken for the third part ordinarily of an hundred years. as Herodorus mentioning the Egyptian fained genealogies: καί τοι τριηκόται μὲν ἀνδρῶν γυναι διωκταὶ μύρια ἕκτα, 300 generations equalize 10000 years, γυναι ὅδ' ἑπείς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὶ ἔτα εἰσι. And after him Clemens Alex. Strom. l. 2. εἰς τὰ ἑκατὶ ἔτη τρεῖς καταλέγον γυναι.

Now being under the termes of *heaven and earth* we have proved all things beside God to be contained, and that the making of all these things was a clear production of them out of nothing; the third part of the explication must of necessity follow, that he which made all things is God. This truth is so evident in it self, and so confessed by all men, that none did ever assert the world was made, but withall affirmed that it was God who made it. There remaineth therefore nothing more in this particular, then to assert God so the Creatour of the world, as he is described in this Article.

Being then we believe in God the Father maker of *heaven and earth*, and by that God we expressed already a singularity of the Deity; our first assertion which we must make good, is, that the one God did create the world. Again, being whosoever is that God cannot be excluded from this act of Creation, as being an emanation of the Divinity, and we seem by these words to appropriate it to the Father, beside whom we shall hereafter shew that we believe some others to be the same God; it will be likewise necessary to declare the reason why the Creation of the world is thus signally attributed to God the Father.

The first of these deserves no explication of it self, it is so obvious to all which have any true conception of God. But because it hath been formerly denied, (as there is nothing so senseless, but some kind of hereticks have embraced, and may be yet taken up in times of which we have no reason to presume better then of the former) I shall briefly declare the Creation of the world to have been performed by that one God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As for the first, there is no such difference between things of the world, as to inferre a diversity of makers of them, nor is the least or worst of creatures in their originall any way derogatory to the Creatour. *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good,* Gen. i. 31. and consequently like to come from the fountain of all goodness, and fit always to be ascribed to the same. Whatsoever is evil, is not so by the Creatours action, but by the creatures defection.

In vain then did the Hereticks of old, to remove a seeming inconvenience, renounce a certain truth, and whilst they * fear'd to make their own God evil, they made him partiall, or but half the Deity, and even so a companion at least with an evil God. For dividing all things of this world into natures substantially evil, and substantially good, and apprehending a necessity of an origination conformable to so different a condition, they imagined one God essentially good, as the first principle of the one, another God essentially evil, as the originall of the other. And this strange Heresie began upon the first † spreading of the Gospel; as if the greatest light could not appear without a shadow.

* Inde Manichæus, ut Deum à conditione malorum liberet, alterum mali inducit autorem. S. Hieron. in Nahum. c. 3.

† For we must not look upon Manes as the first author of

the Heresy, though they which followed him were called from him Manichæans. Nor must we be satisfied with the relation of Socrates, who allows the beginning of that Heresy *μικρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν Κωνσταντίνου χρόνων* a little before Constantine, being Epiphanius asserts the first Author of it, *σέλλειδ' ἐπὶ τὰ Ἰερουσόλυμα πρὶν τοῦ χρόνου τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, to have gone to Jerusalem even in the A

posses times. Manes then, formerly called Cubricus, not Urbicus, as S. Aug. who disseminated this Heresy in the dayes of Aurelianus or Probus the Emperour, about the year 277. had a predecessor, though not a Master, call'd first Terebinthus, after Buddas. For this Buddas left his books and estate to a widow, who, saith Epiphanius, ἔμεινε πολλὸν τῷ Χρῆστῳ ἔτι, continued with his estate and books a long time, and at last bought Cubricus for her servant. This Buddas had a former Master called Scythianus, the first author of this Heresy. Beside these, between Scythianus and Cubricus there was yet another teacher of the doctrine, called Zaranes. Ἦν δὲ πρὸ τούτου (Μάνη) ὁ ἑταῖρος τῆς κακίας διδασκαλίας, Ζαράνης ὀνόματι, ὁμολογῶν αὐτῷ ὑπακούων. If then we insert this Zaranes into the Manichean Pedegree, and consider the time of the widow between Buddas and Cubricus, and the age of Cubricus, who was then but seven yeares old, as Socrates testifies, when she resolved to buy him, and discover the Heresy to him; there will be no reason to doubt of the relation of Epiphanius, that Scythianus began in the Apostolicall times. Nor need we any of the abatements in the Animadversions of Petavius, much lesse the redargution of Epiphanius, who cites Origen as an assertour of the Christian Faith against this Heresy: For though he certainly died before Manes spread his doctrine, yet it was written in severall books before him, not only in the time of Buddas, to whom Socrates and Suidas attribute them, but of Scythianus, whom S. Cyril and Epiphanius make the author of them. Neither can it be objected that they were not Manicheans before the appearance of Manes; for I conceive the name of Manes, thought by the Greeks to be a name taken up by Cubricus, and proper to him, not to be any proper or peculiar name at all, but the generall title of Heretick in the Syriac tongue. For I am loath to think that Theodoret or the Author in Suidas were so farre mistaken, when they call Scythianus Manes, as to conceive Cubricus and he were the same person: when we may with much better reason conclude that both Scythianus and Cubricus had the same title. For I conceive Manes at first rather a title then a name, from the Hebrew מן or מנא signifying a Heretick. And although some of the Rabbins derive their מן from Manes, yet others make it more ancient then he was, referring it to Tzadok and Balthos call'd מן ה' ה' ה' the first or chief Hereticks, who lived 100 yeares before Christ. wherefore it is farre more rationally to assert, that he which began the Heresy of the Manichees was called מן as an Heretick in the Orientall tongues, and from thence Μάνης by the Greeks, to comply with μαυία or madness in their language; then that Μάνης was first the name of a man counted an Heretick by the Christians, and then made the generall name for all Hereticks, and particularly for the Christians by the Jewes. Which being granted, but Scythianus and Cubricus might well at first have the name of Manes, that is Heretick: However the antiquity of that Heresy will appear in the Marcionites, who differed not in this particular from the Manichees. Duos Ponticus Deos asserit tanquam duas Synplegadas naufragii sui: quem negare non potuit, id est creatorem, id est nostrum; & quem probare non potuit, id est suum. Passus infelix hujus presumptionis instinctum de simplici capitulo Dominice pronuntiationis, in hominibus non in Deos disponentis exempla illa bonæ & malæ arboris, quod neque bona malos neque mala bonos proferat fructus. Tertul. l. 1. c. 2. This Marcion lived in the dayes of Antoninus Pius, and as Eusebius testifieth, Justine Martyr wrote against

against him. Hist. l. 4. c. 11. Irenæus relates how he spake with Polycarpus Bishop of Smyrna, who was taught by the Apostles, and conversed with divers which saw our Saviour. l. 3. c. 3. Neither was Marcion the first which taught it at Rome, for he received it from Cerdon. Hæbit & Cerdonem quendam informatorem scandalum hujus quo facilius duos Deos cæci existimaverunt. This Cerdon succeeded Heracleon, and so at last may be reduced to the Gnosticks.

Whereas there is no nature originally sinfull, no substance in it self evil, and therefore no being which may not come from the same fountain of goodnesse. *I form the light, and create darknesse, I make peace, and create evil, Isa. 45. 5, 7. I the Lord do all these things,* saith he who also said, *I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me.* Vain then is that conceit which fram'd two Gods, one of them called light, the other darknesse, one good, the other evil, refuted in the first words of the Creed, *I believe in God, maker of heaven and earth.*

But as we have already proved that one God to be the Father, so must we yet further shew that one God the Father to be the Maker of the world. In which there is no difficulty at all: the whole Church at Jerusalem hath sufficiently declared this truth in their devotions; *Lord, thou art God which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.* Jesus then was the childe of that God which made the heaven and the earth, and consequently the Father of Christ is the Creatour of the world.

We know that Christ is the light of the Gentiles, by his own interpretation; we are assured likewise that his Father gave him, by his frequent assertion; we may then as certainly conclude that the Father of Christ is the Creatour of the world, by the Prophets expresse prediction: *For, thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out; he which spread forth the earth, Isa. 42. 5, 6. and that which cometh out of it; I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will*

keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.

And now this great facility may seem to create the greater difficulty; for being the Apostles teach us that the Son made all things, and the Prophets, that by the Spirit they were produc'd, how can we attribute that peculiarly in the Creed unto the Father, which in the Scriptures is assigned indifferently to the Son, and to the Spirit? Two reasons may particularly be render'd of this peculiar attributing the work of Creation to the Father. First in respect of those Heresies arising in the infancy of the Church, which endeavoured to destroy this truth, and to introduce another Creatour of the world, distinguish'd from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An error so destructive to the Christian religion, that it raceth even the foundations of the Gospel, which referres it self wholly to the promises in the law, and pretends to no other God, but that God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*, acknowledgeth no other speaker by the Son, then him that spake by the Prophets; and therefore whom *Moses* and the Prophets call Lord of heaven and earth, of him our blessed Saviour signifies himself to be the Son, rejoycing in spirit, and saying, *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.* Secondly, in respect of the Paternall priority in the Deity, by reason whereof that which is common to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, may be rather attributed to the Father, as the first Person in the Trinity. In which respect the Apostle hath made a distinction in the phrase of emanation or production, *To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* And our Saviour hath acknowledged, *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do*; which speaketh some kind of priority in action, according to that of the Person. And in this sense the Church did alwayes profess to believe in God the Father * Creatour of heaven and earth.

a Luke 10. 21.

b 1 Cor. 8. 6.

** Stabat fides*

semper in Cre-

atore & Chri-

sto ejus. Ter-

tul. adv. Mar-

cion. l. 1. Non

alia agnoscen-

da erit traditio

Apostolorum,

quam quæ ho-

die apud ipso-

rum ecclesias

editur. Nullam

autem Aposto-

lici census Ec-

clesiam inveni-

as quæ non in

Creatore Chri-

stianæ et, ib.

The great necessity of professing our faith in this particular appeareth severall wayes, as indispensably tending to the illustration of Gods glory, the humiliation of mankind, the provocation to obedience, the aversion from iniquity, and all consolation in our duty.

God is of himself infinitely glorious, because his perfections are absolute, his excellencies indefective: and the splendour of this glory appeareth unto us in and through the works of his hands. *The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternall power and Godhead.* For he hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion. After a long enumeration of the wonderfull works of the creation, the Psalmist breaketh forth into this pious meditation, *O Lord how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.* If then the glory of God be made apparent by the creation, if he have made all things for himself, that is for the manifestation of his glorious attributes, if the Lord rejoiceth in his works, because his glory shall endure for ever; then is it absolutely necessary we should confesse him *Maker of heaven and earth*, that we may sufficiently praise and glorifie him. *Let them praise the name of the Lord,* saith David, *for his name alone is excellent, his glory is above the earth and heaven.* Thus did the Levites teach the children of Israel to glorifie God, *Stand up, and blesse the Lord your God for ever and ever: and blessed be thy glorious name which is exalted above all blessing and praise.* Thou, even thou art Lord alone, thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their hosts, the earth and all things that are therein. And the same hath S. Paul taught us. *For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever, Amen.* Furthermore, that we may be assured that he which made both heaven and earth, will be glorified in both, the

Rom. I. 20.

Isa. 10. 12.
51. 15.

Psal. 104. 24.

Prov. 16. 4.

Psal. 104. 31.

Psal. 148. 13.

Neb. 9. 5, 6.

Rom. 11. 36.

Psal. 148. 2,
3, 4, 5.

Rev. 4. 10, 11.

Psal. 19. 1.

Psal. 145.
10, 11.

Jer. 27. 5.

Psal. 8. 3.

the Prophet calls upon all those celestially hosts to bear their part in this hymne. *Praise ye him all his Angels, praise ye him all his hosts. Praise ye him Sun and Moon, praise him all ye Starres of light. Praise him ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens. Let them praise the name of the Lord, for he commanded, and they were created. And the 24 Elders in the Revelation of S. John, fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their Crowns, the emblemes of their borrowed and derived glories, before the Throne, the seat of infinite and eternall Majesty, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.* Wherefore being the heavens declare the glory of God, and all his works praise him, then shall his Saints blesse him, they shall speak of the glory of his kingdome, and talk of his power. And if man be silent, God will speak; while we through ingratitude will not celebrate, he himself will declare it, and promulgate: *I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power, and by my out-stretched arm.*

Secondly the doctrine of the worlds Creation is most properly effectually towards mans humiliation. As there is nothing more destructive to humanity then pride, and yet not any thing to which we are more prone then that; so nothing can be more properly applied to abate the swelling of our proud conceptions, then a due consideration of the other works of God, with a sober reflexion upon our own originall. *When I consider the heavens the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained; when I view those glorious apparent bodies with my eye, and by the advantage of a glasse find greater numbers before beyond the power of my sight, and from thence judge there may be many millions more which neither eye nor instrument can reach; when I con-*
template

template those farre more glorious spirits, the inhabitants of the heavens, and attendants on thy throne; I cannot but break forth into that admiration of the Prophet, *What is man, that thou art mindfull of him?* what is that offspring of the earth, that dust and ashes? *what is that Son of man, that thou visitest him?* what is there in the progeny of an ejected and condemned Father, that thou shouldest look down from heaven the place of thy dwelling, and take care or notice of him? But if our originall ought so farre to humble us, how should our fall abase us? That of all the creatures which God made, we should comply with him who first opposed his maker, and would be equall unto him from whom he new received his being. All other works of God, which we think inferiour to us, because not furnished with the light of understanding, or endued with the power of election, are in a happy impossibility of sinning, and so offending of their Maker: The glorious spirits which attend upon the throne of God, once in a condition of themselves to fall, now by the grace of God preserved, and placed beyond all possibility of sinning, are entred upon the greatest happinesse of which the workmanship of God is capable: But men, the sons of fallen *Adam*, and sinners after the similitude of him, of all the creatures are the onely companions of those *Angels which left their own habitations*, and are *delivered into chains of darknesse, to be reserved unto judgement*. How should a serious apprehension of our own corruption mingled with the thoughts of our creation, humble us in sight of him, whom we alone of all the creatures by our unrepented sins drew unto repentance? How can we look without confusion of face upon that monument of our infamy, recorded by *Moses, Gen. 6. 6.* who first penned the originall of humanity, *It repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart?*

Jude 6.

2 Pet. 2. 4.

Thirdly, this Doctrine is properly efficacious and productive

R

- ductive of most chearfull and universall obedience. It made the Prophet call for the Commandments of God, and earnestly desire to know what he should obey. *Thy hands have made me and fashioned me; give me understanding that I may learn thy Commandments.* By vertue of our first production, God hath undeniably absolute dominion over us, and consequently there must be due unto him the most exact and compleat obedience from us. Which reason will appear more convincing, if we consider, of all the creatures which have been derived from the same fountain of Gods goodnesse, none ever disobeyed his voice but the Devil and Man. *Mine hand saith he, hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spann'd the heavens, when I call unto them they stand up together.* The most loyall and obedient servants which stand continually before the most illustrious Prince, are not so ready to receive and execute the commands of their soveraign Lord, as all the Hosts of heaven and earth attend upon the will of their Creatour. *Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their hosts by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatnesse of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth, but every one maketh his appearance, ready prest to observe the designs of their Commander in chief.* Thus the Lord commanded, and *they fought from heaven, the starres in their courses fought against Sifera. He commanded the Ravens to feed Elias, and they brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening.* and so one Prophet lived merely upon the obedience of the souls of the air. He spake to the devouring Whale, *and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land.* and so another Prophet was delivered from the jaws of death by the obedience of the fishes of the sea. Do we not read of *fire and haile, snow and vapour, stormy wind fulfilling his word?* Shall there be a greater coldnesse in man then in the snow? more vanity
- Psal. 119. 73.*
- Isa. 48. 13.*
- Isa. 40. 26.*
- Jud. 5. 10.*
- 1 King. 17. 4, 6.*
- Jonah 2. 10.*
- Psal. 148. 8.*

in us then in a vapour? more inconstancy then in the wind? If the universall obedience of the creature to the will of the Creatour cannot move us to the same affection and desire to serve and please him; they will all conspire to testifie against us and condemn us, when God shall call unto them, saying, *Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth, for Isa. 1. 2. the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebell'd against me.*

Lastly, the Creation of the world is of most necessary meditation for the consolation of the servants of God in all the variety of their conditions. *Happy is he whose hope is Psal. 146. 5, 6. in the Lord his God, which made heaven and earth, the sea and all that therein is.* This happinesse consisteth partly in a full assurance of his power to secure us, his ability to satisfie us. *The earth is the Lords, and the fulnesse Psal. 24. 1, 2. thereof, the world and they that dwell therein. For he hath founded it upon the seas, and established it upon the floods.* By vertue of the first production he hath a perpetuall right unto, and power to dispose of all things: and he which can order and dispose of all must necessarily be esteemed able to secure and satisfie any Creature. *Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard Isa. 40. 28. that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creatour of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?* There is no externall resistance or opposition where omnipotency worketh, no internall weaknesse or defection of power where the Almighty is the Agent; and consequently there remaineth a full and firm perswasion of his ability in all conditions to preserve us. Again this happinesse consisteth partly in a comfortable assurance, arising from this Meditation, of the will of God to protect and succour us, of his desire to preserve and bless us. *My help cometh Psal. 121. 2, 3. from the Lord who made heaven and earth, he will not suffer thy foot to be moved, saith the Prophet David, at once expressing the foundation of his own expectancy and our security. God will not despise the work of his hands, Job 10. 3.*

neither will he suffer the rest of his Creatures to do the least injury to his own image. Behold, saith he, *I have created the Smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord.*

Wherefore to conclude our explication of the first Article, and to render a clear account of the last part thereof, that every one may understand what it is I intend, when I make confession of my faith in the *Maker of heaven and earth*, I do truly professe, that I really believe, and am fully perswaded, that both heaven and earth and all things contained in them have not their being of themselves, but were made in the beginning ; that the manner by which all things were made was by mediate or immediate creation ; so that antecedently to all things beside, there was at first nothing but God, who produced most part of the world merely out of nothing, and the rest out of that which was formerly made of nothing. This I believe was done by the most free and voluntary act of the will of God, of which no reason can be alledged, no motive assigned, but his goodnesse ; performed by the determination of his will at that time which pleased him, most probably within one hundred and thirty generations of men, most certainly within much lesse then six thousand yeares. I acknowledge this God Creatour of the world to be the same God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ : and in this full latitude, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.*

ARTICLE II.

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord.

THe second *Article* of the *Creed* presents unto us, as the object of our faith, the second Person of the blessed Trinity; that as in the Divinity there is nothing intervening between the Father and the Son, so that immediate union might be perpetually express'd by a constant conjunction in our Christian *Confession*. And that upon no lesse authority then of the *Authour and Finisher of our faith*, who in the persons of the Apostles gave this command to us, *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* Nor speaketh *Joh. 14. 1.* he this of himself, but from the Father which sent him; *for this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ.* According therefore to the *1 Joh. 3. 23.* Sons prescription, the Fathers injunction, and the Sacramentall institution, as we are baptized, so do we believe in the name of the Father, and the Son.

Our blessed Saviour is here represented under a three-fold description: first by his Nomination, as *Jesus Christ*; secondly by his Generation, as the *only Son* of God; thirdly by his Dominion, as *our Lord*.

But when I referre *Jesus Christ* to the Nomination of our Saviour, because he is in the Scriptures promiscuously and indifferently sometimes called Jesus, sometimes Christ, I would be understood so as not to make either of them equally or in like propriety his Name. *His name was called Jesus, which was so named of the Angel before he* *Luke 2. 21.* *was conceived in the wombe; who is also called Christ,* *Matt. 1. 16.* not by * name, but by office and title. Which observa- * Si tamen nomen est Christus, & non appellatio potius; Unctus enim significatur. Unctus autem non magis nomen est quam vestitus, quam calceatus, accidens nomini res. *Tertull. adv.*

Prax. c. 28. Quorum nominum alterum est proprium, quod ab Angelo impositum est, alterum accedens, quod ab unctione convenit. lb. Christus commune dignitatis est nomen, Jesus proprium vocabulum Salvatoris. *S. Hieron. in Mat. 16. 20.* Jesus inter homines nominatur, nam Christus non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis & regni. *Lactan. de Falsa Sap. lib. 4. c. 7.* Dum dicitur Christus, commune nomen dignitatis est, dum Jesus Christus, proprium vocabulum Salvatoris est. *Isidor. Orig. l. 7. c. 2.* Ἰησοῦς καλεῖται φερωνύμως. *S. Cyr. Catich. 10.*

tion, seemingly triviall, is necessary for the full explication of this part of the Article; for by this distinction we are led unto a double notion, & so resolve our faith into these two propositions. I believe there was and is a man, whose name was actually, and is truly in the most high importance *Jesus*, the Saviour of the world. I believe the man who bare that name to be the Christ, that is, the Messias promised of old by God, and expected by the Jewes.

For the first, it is undoubtedly the proper name of our Saviour given unto him, according to the custome of the Jewes, at his circumcision: and as the Baptist was called *John*, even so the Christ was called *Jesus*. Besides, as the imposition was after the vulgar manner, so was the name itself of ordinary use. We read in the Scriptures of *Jesus which was called Justus*, a fellow-worker with *S. Paul*, and of a certain sorcerer, a Jew, whose name was *Barjesus*, that is the son of *Jesus*. *Josephus* in his History mentioneth one *Jesus* the son of *Ananus*, another the son of *Sadaphates*, a third the son of *Judas*, slain in the temple: and many of the High Priests or Priests were called by that name, as the son of *Damnaus*, of *Gamaliel*, of *Onias*, of *Phabes*, and of *Thebuth*. *Ecclesiasticus* is call'd the Wisdome of *Jesus* the son of *Sirach*, and that *Sirach* the son of another *Jesus*. * *S. Steven* speaks of the *Tabernacle of witnesse brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles*: and the Apostle in his explication of those words of *David*, *To day if ye will hear his voice*, observeth, that *if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day*. Which two Scrip-
tures

Col. 4. 11.

Act. 13. 6.

Habuit & Judas quosdam Jesus, quorum vacuis gloriatur vocabulis. Illa enim nec lucent, nec pascunt, nec medentur. Bernard. in Cant.

Serm. 15.

* *Act. 7. 45.*

Heb. 4. 8.

ptures being undoubtedly understood of *Joshua* the son of *Nun*. teach us as infallibly that *Jesus* is the same name with *Joshua*. Which being at the first † imposition in the full extent of pronounciation *Jehoshua*, in proceſſe of time contracted to *Jeshuah*, by the omiſſion of the laſt letter (ſtrange and difficult to other languages) and the addition of the Greek termination, became *Jesus*.

† *First יהושע* as generally in the books of *Moses*, in *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Samuel*, the *Kings*, yea even

in *Haggai* and *Zachariah*: then contracted into *יושי*, as in the 1 Chron. 24. 11. 2 Chron. 31. 15. and constantly in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*. Next the laſt letter *y* was but lightly pronounced, as appears by the Greek translation 1 Chro. 7. 27. where *יושי* is rendered in the Roman Copy *Inoue*, in the Aldus and Complutensian Editions *Ioune*, and by Eusebius, who expreſſeth it truer then those Copies, *Iouca*. At laſt *y* was totally left out both in the pronounciation and the writing, and the whole name of *Jeshuah* contracted to *יושי*.

1 Chron. 24. 11.

Next the laſt letter *y* was

where *יושי* is rendered in the Roman Copy *Inoue*, in the Aldus and Complutensian Editions *Ioune*, and by Eusebius, who expreſſeth it truer then those Copies, *Iouca*.

At laſt *y* was totally left out both in the pronounciation and the writing, and the whole name of *Jeshuah* contracted to *יושי*.

Wherefore it will be neceſſary for the proper interpretation of *Jesus*, to look back upon the firſt that bare that name, who was the ſon of *Nun*, of the tribe of *Ephraim*, the ſucceſſour of *Moses*, and ſo nam'd by him, as it is written, *And Moses called Oſhea the ſon of Nun Jehoshua*. Numb. 13. 16. His firſt name then impoſed at his circumciſion was *Oſhea* or *Hoseah*, the ſame with the name of the ſon of *Azaziah*, ruler of *Ephraim*, of the ſon of *Elah*, king of *Israel*, of the ſon of *Beer*, the Prophet; and the interpretation of this firſt name * *Hoseah* is *Saviour*. Now we muſt not imagine this to be † no mutation, neither muſt we look upon it as a || totall alteration, but obſerve it as a change not triviall or * inconfiderable. And being *Hoseah* was a name afterwards uſed by ſome, and *Jehoshua*, as diſtinct,

Numb. 13. 16.

1 Chro. 27. 20.

2 King. 17. 1. Hof. 1. 1.

* *Oſee* in lingua noſtra *Salvatore* ſonar, quod nomen habuit etiam *Josue* filius

Nun, antequam ei à Deo vocabulum mutaretur. S. Hieron. in *Oſee* c. 1. v. 1. & lib. 1. adv. Jovinianum. I read indeed of other interpretations among the Greeks, no good expoſitors of the Hebrew names: as in an ancient MS. of the LXX Translation of the Prophets, now in the Library of Cardinall Barberini, at the beginning of *Hoseah*, *Ωουε*, *λυτουμεν* &: and again, *Ωουε*, *Γεωσμεν* &, *η Γουσιδων*. Of which the firſt and laſt are farre from the Originall, and the middle agreeable with the root, not with the conjugation, as being deduc'd from *יושי* not in Niphal, but in Hiphil. † As the Samaritan Pentateuch makes it the ſame name which he was

by

first named, and which he had afterwards; as if Moses had only called Othea, Othea. || So Justine Martyr speaks of Hoseah as *μετονομασθέντι τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι*. And comparing it with that alteration of Jacobs name: *τὸ ἐπώνυμον Ἰακώβ τὸ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπεκλήθητι ἐσθ' ἐν, καὶ τὸ Ἀυσὴ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦς ἐπεκλήθη*. where, to passe by his mistake in supposing him first named Israel, and after called Jacob, he makes the alteration of Hoseah to Joshua, equall to that of Jacob to Israel. The reason whereof was the Greek version of the name, who for Hoseah translated it Ἀυσὴς. Dum Moysi successor destinaretur Ausus filius Nave, transfertur certe de prius nomina, & incipit vocari Jesus. Tertul. adv. Jud. & adv. Marcion. lib. 3. §. 16. and was farther estranged yet by those which frequently called him Ναυσὴς, as Euseb. Demonst. Ev. l. 4. c. 17. thrice. * This Justine Martyr charges upon the Jewes as neglected by them, and affirms the reason why they received not Jesus for the Christ, was their not observing the alteration of Hoseah into Joshua or Jesus. *Αὐτὸν καλούμενον Ἰησοῦν Μωσὴς ἐκάλει. τῷ οὖν ἐζητήσας δὲ ἦν αἰτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἐκ ἀπορίας, καὶ φιλοπυσίας. ποιῶν γὰρ ἀληθεύει σὶ ὁ Χριστός, καὶ ἀναμνησκῶν ἐς Γωίνους. And whereas they spake much of the change made in the names of Abram and Sarai, which were but of a letter, they took no notice of this totall alteration of the name. so he. Διὰ τί μὲν ἐν ἄλλῃ πρώτῳ προσετίθει τῷ Ἀβραμ ὀνόματι θεολογίαις, καὶ διὰ τί ἐν ῥῷ τῷ Σάρραι ὀνόματι, ὁμοίως κομπολογίαις; Διὰ τί δὲ τὸ πατεῖσθαι ὄνομα τῷ Ἀυσὴ τῷ ἡν Ναυὴ ὅλον μετονομασθαι τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐζητήσας. where, to passe by the vulgar mistake of the Greeks, who generally deliver the addition of *a* in the name of Abraham, and *e* in the name of Sarah, when the first was an addition of *n*, the second a change of *i* into *n*, he would make that of Hosea into Jesus a farre more considerable alteration, then that of Abraham or of Sarah.*

by others, it will necessarily follow, there was some difference between these two names; and it will be fit to enquire what was the addition, and in what the force of the alteration doth consist.

וְיֵשׁוּעַ
וְיֵשׁוּעַ

First therefore, we observe that all the originall letters in the name *Hoseah* are preserved in that of *Joshua*: from whence 'tis evident that this alteration was not made by a verball mutation, as when *Jacob* was called *Israel*, nor by any literall change, as when *Sarai* was named *Sarah*, nor yet by diminution or mutilation; but by addition, as when *Abram* was called *Abraham*. Secondly, it must be confests'd, that there is but one literall addition, and that of that letter which is most frequent in the Hebrew names; but being thus solemnly added by *Moses*, upon so remarkable an occasion as the viewing of the land of

Canaan

CANAAN was, and that unto a name already known, and after used; it cannot be thought to give any lesse then a † present designation of his person to be a Saviour of the people, and future certainty of salvation included in his name unto the *Israelites* by his means. Thirdly, though the number of the letters be augmented actually but to one, yet it is not improbable that another may be virtually added, and in the signification understood. For being the first letter of *Hoseah* will not endure a duplication, and if the same letter were to be added, one of them must be absorb't; tis possible another of the same might be by *Moses* intended, and one of them suppress'd. If then unto the name *Hoseah* we joyn one of the titles of God, which is *Jah*, there will result from both, by the custome of that Hebrew tongue, *Jehoshuah*; and so not onely the * instrumentall, but also the originall cause of the Jewes

† For it may well be thought that is added to make the name יהוה the same with the third person of the future in Hiphil, יהוה. For although ה the characteristical letter of the conjugation Hiphil, be excluded in the fu-

ture tense, and so the regular word be יהוה frequently in use; yet sometimes it is express'd, as it is used 1 Sam. 17. 47. יהוה יושיה ויהוה יחרב ויחרב לא and all the assembly shall know that the Lord saveth (or will save) not with sword and spear: and Psal. 116. 6. דלתי ולי ויהוה. I was brought low, and he helped me. And although there be another י in the future, then in the name, yet being it is also found sometimes with the lesser Chiric, and so without the later י, or without any Chiric at all, as frequently with the addition of נ, יהוה, there is no reason but יהוה the name of the Son of Nun, may be of the same force, as consisting of the same letters, with the third person of the Future in Hiphil. Again, being י added to the Future, as formative thereof, stands in the place of י (for the avoiding of confusion with י conjunctive) which is nothing else then the abbreviation of יהוה, we may well assign at least this Emphasis to the mutation which *Moses* made; that whereas before there was nothing but salvation barely in his name, now there is no lesse then he shall save, in which the יהוה or י is a peculiar designation of the person, and the shall or Tense, a certainty of the futurity. Thus will the design of Moses appear to be nothing else but a prediction or confirmation of that which was not before, but by way of desire or omination; and this only by changing the Imperative into the Future. יהוה serva, the expectation of the people, יהוה servabit, the ratification of *Moses*. * So did the Ancients understand it: to the Greeks *Jesus* is σωτήριον Θεῷ, to the Latines, *Salvator Dei*. So Euseb. Demonstr. Ev. l. 4. ad finem. Ἐπεὶ δὲ σωτήριον Θεῷ οἷς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνήν τὸ θεῷ Ἰωσὺ μισαλληφέν ὄνομα σημαίνει. Ἰσχυὰ μὲν γὰρ παρ' Ἑβραίων Καθνεῖα, ὡς δὲ Ναυὴ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς Ἰωσὺ ὀνομαζέται Ἰωσὺ δὲ ἰσὺ Ἰαὺ Καθνεῖα, τὸ τ' ἰσὺ, Θεῷ σωτήριον. Where nothing can be more certain then

that *Ἰαὼ* is taken for the name of God, and *Ἰαὼ σωτηρία* together the salvation of God. And yet Theophylact has strangely mistaken it. Mat. 1. 1. Τὸ Ἰησοῦς ὄνομα ἐκ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐστὶν ἀλλ' Ἑβραϊκόν, ἑρμηνεύεται δὲ σωτὴρ, *Ἰαὼ* γὰρ ἡ σωτηρία παρ' Ἑβραίοις λέγεται. which words seem plainly to signify that Jesus is interpreted Saviour, because *Ἰαὼ* in the Hebrew tongue signifieth salvation. I confesse the words may be strained to the same sense with those of Eusebius but not without some force, and contrary to what he seemeth to intend. Especially considering those which followed him in the same mistake, as Moschopolus, περὶ θεσβῶν. Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ *Ἰαὼ* γίνεται, ὃ δηλοῖ παρ' Ἑβραίοις τὴν σωτηρίαν. whereas *Ἰαὼ* in Eusebius is certainly no other then *יהוה*, and *Ἰσὺά* then *יהושע*, and so *Ἰωσὺά*, contracted of *Ἰαὼ Ἰσὺά*, the salvation of God. Nor is this only the opinion of Eusebius but of S. Hierome, a man much better acquainted with the Hebrew language; who in the first Chapter of *Hoseah*, shewing that *Iosuah* had first the same name with that of the Prophet, saith, Non enim (ut male in Græcis codicibus legitur & Latini) *Ause* dictus est, quod nihil omnino intelligitur; sed *Osce*, id est, Salvator: & additum est ejus nomini Dominus, ut Salvator Domini diceretur. What then was it but *יהוה* the Dominus added to his name? For as in the name of *Esaias* S. Hierome acknowledgeth the addition of the name of God, Interpretatur autem *Esaias* Salvator Domini; in the same manner did he conceive it in the name of *Iosuah*, only with this difference, that in the one it begins, in the other concludes the name.

deliverance will be found expressed in one word: as if *Moses* had said, this is the person by whom God will save his people from their enemies.

Now being we have thus declared that *Jesus* is the same name with *Josuah*, being the name of *Josuah* was first imposed by divine designation, as a certain prediction of the fulfilling to the *Israelites* by the person which bare the name, all which was signified by the name, being *Jesus* was likewise named by a more immediate imposition from heaven, even by the ministration of an Angel; it followeth, that we believe he was infallibly designed by God to perform unto the sons of men whatsoever is implied in his nomination. As therefore in *Hoseah* there was expressed salvation, in *Josuah* at least was added the designation of that single person to save, with certainty of preservation, & probably even the name of God, by whose appointment and power he was made a Saviour; so shall we find the same in *Jesus*. In the first salutation, the An-

gel Gabriel told the blessed Virgin, she should conceive in her wombe, and bring forth a son, and should call his name Jesus. in the dream of Joseph the Angel of the Lord

Luke 1. 31.

informed him not onely of the nomination, but of the interpretation or * Etymologie; *Thou shalt call his name*

* Jesus Hebræo sermone, Salvator dicitur. Etymologia ergo nominis ejus Evangelista signavit, dicens, Vocabis nomen ejus Iesum, quia ipse saluum faciet populum suum S. Hieron.

* αὐτοῦ, ipse.

Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. In which words is clearly expres'd the designation of the person, *He*, and the futuration of salvation certain by him, *he shall save.* Beside that other addition of the name of God,

propounded in *Josuah* as probable, appeareth here in some degree above probability, and that for two reasons.

First, because it is not barely said that *He*, but as the Originall raiseth it, * *He himself shall save.* *Josuah* saved

Israel not by his own power, not of himself, but God by him; neither saved he his own people, but the people of

God: whereas *Jesus* himself, by his own power, the power of God, shall save his own people, the people of God.

Well therefore may we understand the interpretation of his name to be *God the Saviour.* Secondly, Immediately upon the prediction of the name of *Jesus*, and the interpretation given by the Angel, the Evangelist expressly

obliveth, *All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet saying, Be*

Mat. 1. 22, 23.

hold, a Virgin shall be with childe, and shall bring forth a

son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being

interpreted, is, God with us. Severall wayes have been invented to shew the fulfilling of that prophesy, notwithstanding our Saviour was not call'd *Emmanuel*; but none

can certainly appear more proper, then that the sense of *Emmanuel* should be comprehended in the name of *Jesus*;

and what else is *God with us*, then *God our Saviour*? Well therefore hath the Evangelist conjoyned * the Pro-

* βλέπεις Ἰουδαίμους Ἐβραῖους καὶ ἁγγέλους;

phet and the Angel, asserting Christ was therefore named

Emmanuel; and the Angel, asserting Christ was therefore named

Emmanuel; and the Angel, asserting Christ was therefore named

προφῆτῃ ῥήσεις; μηδερμηνευόμενον γὰρ τὸ μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, ὃ ἐστὶ σωτηρία τῷ λαῷ, τὸ μετὰ δούλων δεσπότην ἐμφιλοχεῖν. Andreas Cretensis in Circumc.

Jesus, because it was foretold he should be called *Emmanuel*, the Angelicall God the Saviour, being in the highest propriety the Propheticall God with us.

However the constant scripture-interpretation of this name is Saviour. So said the Angel of the Lord to the amazed shepherds, *Unto you is born this day in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.* So *S. Paul* to the Jewes and Gentil-Profelytes at *Antioch*:

Act. 13. 22. Of this mans seed hath God according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour Jesus. Which explication of this sacred name was not more new or strange unto the world, then was the name it self so often us'd before. For the ancient *Grecians* usually gave it at first as a title to their † Gods, whom after any remarkable preservations they stiled *Saviours*, and under that notion built temples,

† Jupiter the chief of them was most usual-

ly worshipp'd under this title. *Euripides* makes *Amphitryo*, setting by his Altar, which *Hercules* had built, Βαμὼν καὶ Διὶ τὸν δὲ Σωτῆρα Διός. and *Aristophanes* introduces *Bacchus* wearing, Νῆ τὸν Δία τὸν Σωτῆρα. as if it were the familiar oath among the *Athenians*, as well it might be, who had his temple in their *Piræum*, as *Strabo* testifieth, l. 9. where *Demosthenes* by vertue of a Decree was to build him an Altar, *Plut.* in *Vita Dem.* and his Porch in the City, which was call'd indeed vulgarly, τῷ Ἐλευθερίου Διός ὄνα. yet was it also named τῷ Σωτῆρι, as *Harpocration* and *Hesychius* have observed. Ὅτι δὲ ἐπὶ λέγεσθαι μὲν Σωτῆρα, ὀνομαζέσθαι δὲ τῷ Ἐλευθερίῳ, πολλοὶ καὶ Μένανδρο. so the first. Τῶν Μήδων ἐκφυγόντος ἰδρύσασθαι τὸν Ἐλευθερίου Δία, τῦτον δὲ ἔνιοι καὶ Σωτῆρα φασί. so the later. As in their oaths, so in their feasts they mentioned him alwayes at the third cup. Τὸν τρίτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου καὶ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἔλεγον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον ἡρώων, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σωτῆρα, sub. Διός. which is omitted in *Hesychius*, as appears out of *Archeus.* l. 2. & 15. and especially that of *Alexis* the Comedian: Ἄλλ' ἔρχου Ἀυτῷ Διὸς καὶ πρώτῳ Σωτῆρι. θεῶν θνήσκουσιν πάντων χρησιμώτατος ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ Σωτῆρ. *Pausanias* in *Corinthiacis*, *Messenicis*, *Laconicis* & *Arcadicis*, mentions severall Statues and Temples anciently dedicated to Jupiter ἐπὶ κλησιν Σωτῆρι. And though this Title was so generally given to Jupiter, as that *Hesychius* expound. Σωτῆρ ὁ Ζεὺς, yet was it likewise attributed to the other Gods: as *Herodotus* relates how the *Grecians* in their Navall warre against the *Perlians*, made their vovoes Ποσειδῶνι Σωτῆρι, and that they preserved the Title to *Neptune* in his dayes. l. 7. And *Artemidorus* takes notice that *Cistior* and *Pollux* are taken for the θεοὶ Σωτῆρες, whom the *Poem* bearing the name of *Orpheus* to *Musæus* calls μεγάλους Σωτῆρας ὁμῆ Διὸς ἀφ' ὧν τεύκνα. as the Hymne of *Hom.* Σωτῆρας

and

τῆς παιδὸς ἐπὶ χθονίων ἀνθρώπων, Ὀκυπόρων τε νεῶν. — and Theocritus in the Idyllion on them, Ἀνθρώπων σωτῆρες ἐπὶ ξυρῇ ἥδ' ἐόντων. Hence Lucian in Alexandro useth it as their constant title, ἀλεξίκακα Ἡράκλεις, καὶ Ζεὺ ἀποτρόπαιος, καὶ Διόσκουροι Σωτῆρες. Neither have we mention of the title only, but of the Original, and occasion of it. For when Castor and Pollux thrust the sons of Theseus out of Athens, and made Menestheus King, he gave them first this name, διὰ ταῦτα πρώτῳ ὁ Μενεστεύς ἀνακίδας τε καὶ Σωτῆρας ὠνόμασεν. *Ælian. Var. Hist. l. 4. c. 5.* Beside these, we read in the ancient inscriptions, Ἀσκληπιῷ Θεῷ Σωτῆρι. and again, Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ Ὑγίᾳ Σωτῆρσι. For as they had their Female Deities, so did they attribute this title to their Goddesses. As to Venus, Ἀφροδίτῃ Θεῇ Παναγίδι καὶ Σωτῆρι. to Diana, Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτῆρι, as the same collection of inscriptions hath it. Thus the Epigram extant in Suidas, Φωσφόρος, ὁ Σώτης, ἐπὶ Παλλάδος Ἰσαδὶ κλήρων, Ἀρτεμι. — The Bzenes an ancient people in Peloponnesus, Ἀρσέμιον ὀνομάζουσι Σώτηραν. *Paul. in Laconicis.* Her temple and statue in the City Troezen, was built and nam'd by Theseus at his safe return from Crete. The Megarenses preserved by her from the Persians, ἐπὶ τῇ Σωτῆρας ἀγάλματι ἐπιθήσαντο Ἀρτέμιδι. and upon the same occasion another of the same bignesse set up at Page. 10. But this title especially was given to Minerva. Σώτηρα. ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ παρά τοις Ἕλλησιν. *Hesych.* Ἐστὶ δ' Ἀθηνᾶ Σώτηρα λεγόμενη, ἣ καὶ Δύσις. *Schol. Aristoph. in Ranas.* Aristotle in his will oblig'd Nicanor to a dedication, διὰ Σωτῆρα καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ Σωτῆρα. *Laert. in Vit. Arist.*

and consecrated altars to them. Nor did they rest with their mistaken piety, but made it stoop unto their baser flattery, calling those men their † *Saviours*, for whom they seem'd to have as great respect and honour as for their Gods.

† This was the constant title of the first Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, given

to him by the Rhodians. Ὀνόμαζα μὲν δὴ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ Πτολεμαῖοι Σωτῆρα, ἄλλῃ δ' ἐπικλήσις ἄλλῃ καὶ δὲ φιλομήτορα καλεῖσι, καὶ φιλάδελφον ἔτερον, τὸν δὲ τῷ Λάγῳ Σωτῆρα, παρὰ δόντων Ῥοδίων τὸ ὄνομα. *Paul. Atticis.* which name first given him by the Rhodians, was no way express'd in his usage of the Syrian, as is observed by Josephus. ὡς καὶ τὴν Σελανᾶ πᾶσαν ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου τῷ Λάγῳ Σωτῆρι ὅτι χημηπίζοντο, τὰ ἐναντία παθεῖν αὐτῷ τῇ ἐπικλήσει. This was so familiar, that Terul. useth the Title instead of the name. Post eum, (i.e. Alexandrum) regnavit illic in Alexandria Soter annis 35. Thus Antigonus was first call'd by the Greeks their Εὐεργέτης or benefactor, then Σωτῆρ or Saviour. ἡ μόνον ἐκρίθη παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν Εὐεργέτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ μεταλλάξας, Σωτῆρ *Polyb. l. 5.* Thus we read of Demetrius who restored the Athenians to their liberty. ἀνεκρότησεν, καὶ ἐσθόντες ἐκέλευον ἀποβαλεῖν τὸν Δημήτριον, Σωτῆρα καὶ Εὐεργέτην ἀναρρεῖοντες. *Plut. in vita.* And not only so, but numbred Demetrius and Antigonus among their Divi Soteres; and instead of their annuall Archon, whose name they used in their

d distinction of years, they created a Priest of these Dii Soteres, as the same Author testifieth. *μόνος δὲ Σωτήρας ἀνέγραψαν θεὸς, καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ πνεῦμον καὶ πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ παῖδας αὐτοῦ, ἱεροῦ Σωτήρων ἐχειροτόνην καθ' ἑκάστον ἐνιαυτόν.* Appian relates of Demetrius, that he received this title from the Babylonians. *Τίμαρχον ἐπακισαμένον ἀνελών, καὶ τὰλλα πομπῶς τῆς βαβυλωνίως ἡγούμενον, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ Σωτῆς ἀρξαμένων τῆς βαβυλωνίων ἀνομάσθη.* De Bell. Syriac. Lucian's mistake in his Saturation tells us of 'Αντίοχος ὁ Σωτῆρ, and Appian gives us the routing of the Gauls as the cause of that title: *ὁς καὶ Σωτῆρ ἐπεκλήθη Γαλάταις ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐμβαδόντας ἐξελάσας.* Ibid. And in process of time this title grew so customary and familiar, that the Sicilians bestowed it upon Verres their oppressor. *Itaque illum non solum Patronum istius insulæ, sed etiam Sotera inscriptum vidit Syracusis;* says Cicero, Verrin. 2.

Nor does it alwayes signifie so much as that it may not be attributed to man, for even in the Scriptures the Judges of Israel were called no lesse then their *Saviours*.
Judg. 3. 9. *When the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of Kenaz.* And again,
3. 15. *when they cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised them up a deliverer, Ehud the son of Gera.* Where though in our translation we call Othniel and Ehud deliverers, yet in the Originall they are plainly termed † *Saviours*.

† Heb. *וְיִשְׁעוּ*
וְיִשְׁעוּ
וְיִשְׁעוּ
וְיִשְׁעוּ

So the LXX clearly. *καὶ ἤγειρε κύριος Σωτῆρα τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔσταν αὐτὸς, τὸν Γοδονιὰ υἱὸν Κενὲζ.* Qui suscitavit eis Salvatorem & liberavit eos, Othniel. Again, *καὶ ἤγειρε κύριος αὐτοῖς Σωτῆρα τὸν Ἀὐδ υἱὸν Γερά.* Qui suscitavit eis Salvatorem vocabulo Aioth filium Gera. *Vet. Transl.* Upon which place S. Aug. notes, *Animadvertendum est autem quod Salvatorem dicat etiam hominem, per quem Deus salvos facit.* Quæst. l. 7. c. 18.

Now what the full import and ultimate sense of the Title of *Saviour* might be, seemed not easy to the ancients: and the * best of the *Latines* thought the Greek
 * So Cicero in the place before recited, having said he saw Verres inscrib'd Sotera, goes on, *Hoc quantum est? in magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non possit.* But though in Cicero's time there was no Latine word used in that sense, yet not long after it was familiar. For as in the Greek inscriptions we read often Dedications: *Διὶ Σωτῆρι:* so in the Latine we find often *Jovi Servatori*, or *Conservatori*, sometimes *Jovi Salvatori* or *Salutari*.
 word

All which are nothing else but the Latine expressions of the Greek inscriptions. And without question Σωτήρ might have been rendred Sospitator, and even Sospes as it was used in the dayes of Ennius. Sospes, salvus: Ennius tamen sospitem pro servatore posuit. Festus. Neither indeed could the Sicilians mean any more of Verres, by the word Sotera, then Tully spake of himself, when he stiled himself Servatorem reipub. At least Tacitus did conceive that Conservator is as much as Soter, when spe. king of Milichus, who detected the conspiracies to Nero, he saith, Milichus præmiis ditatus Conservatoris sibi nomen, Græco ejus rei vocabulo assumpsit. Annal. l. 15. He took to himself the name of Conservator, in a Greek word which signifies so much, and without question that must be Σωτήρ. However, the first Christians of the Latine Church were some time in doubt what word to use, as the constant interpretation of Σωτήρ so frequent and essential to Christianity. Tertullian useth saluificator, or, as some books read it, saluificator. Ego jam non unus Deus, nec unus Saluificator, si duo saluti artifices, & utique alter altero indigens. de Carne Christi c. 14. and shews it was so translated in the Philippians 3. 20. Et quidem de terra in cælum, ubi nostrum municipatum Philippenses quoque ab Apostolo discunt; unde & Saluificatorem nostrum expræamus Jesum Christum. de Resur. Carnis, c. 47. S. Hilary thought Salutaris a sufficient interpretation. Est autem Salutaris ipso illo nomine quo Jesus nuncupatur. Jesus enim secundum Hebraicam linguam Salutaris est. in Psal. 118. S. August. indifferent between that and Salvator: Deus salvos faciendi Dominus est Jesus, quod interpretatur Salvator, sive Salutaris, and so Lactant. At last they generally us'd the word Salvator, First Tertullian. Christus in illo significabatur, taurus ob utramque dispositionem; aliis terus, ut jodex, aliis mansuetus, ut Salvator. adv. Marcion. l. 3. 18. Which word of his was rather followed by his imitator S. Cyprian, after whom Arnobius us'd it, after him his disciple Lactantius: and from thence it continued the constant language of the Church, till the late innovators thrust it out of the Latine Translation.

word so pregnant and comprehensive, that the Latine tongue had no single word able to expresse it.

But whatsoever notion the Heathen had of their Gods or men which they stiled Saviours, we know this name belongeth unto Christ in a more sublime, and peculiar manner. Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Act. 4. 12.

It remaineth therefore that we should explain how, and for what reasons Christ truly is, and properly is call'd our Saviour. First then. I conceive one sufficient cause of that appellation to consist in this, that he hath opened and declared unto us the onely true way for the obtaining eternall

Rom. 11. 14. *all salvation, and by such patefaction can deserve no lesse then the name of Saviour. For if those Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel, who received the way of salvation from him which they delivered unto others, may be said to save those Persons, which were converted by their preaching; in a farre more eminent and excellent manner must he be said to save them, who first revealed all those truths unto them. S. Paul provok'd to emulation them which were his flesh that he might save some of them; and was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some. He exhorted Timothy to take heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine, and continue in them; for in doing this, he should both save himself, and them that heard him. And S. James speaks in more generall termes. Brethren, if any of you do erre from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death. Now if these are so expressely said to save the souls of them which are converted by the doctrine which they deliver, with much more reason must Christ be said to save them, whose ministers they are, and in whose name they speak. For it was he which came and preached peace to them which were as farre off, and to them that were nigh. The Will of God concerning the salvation of man was reveal'd by him. No man hath seen God at any time: the onely begotten Son, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him. Being then the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, being they which preach it at the command of Christ are said to save the soules of such as believe their word, being it was Christ alone who brought life and immortality to light through the gospel; therefore he must in a most eminent and singular manner be acknowledged to save, and consequently must not be denied, even in this first respect the title of Saviour.*

1 Cor. 9. 22.
 1 Tim. 4. 16.
 Jam. 5. 20.
 Eph. 2. 17.
 Job. 1. 18.
 Rom. 1. 16.
 2 Tim. 1. 10.

Secondly, this *Jesus* hath not only revealed, but also procured

procured the way of salvation, not onely delivered it to us, but also wrought it out for us: and so God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved. We were all concluded under sin, and being the wages of sin is death, we were obliged to eternall punishment, from which it was impossible to be freed, except the sin were first remitted. Now this is the constant rule, that without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that Christ should appear to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And so he did, for he shed his blood for many, for the remission of sins, as himself professeth in the Sacramentall institution: he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, as S. Peter speaks. and so in him we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. And if while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us: much more then being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him. Again, we were all enemies unto God, and having offended him, there was no possible way of salvation, but by being reconciled to him. If then we ask the question, as once the Philistines did concerning David, wherewith should we reconcile our selves unto our Master? we have no other name to answer it but Jesus. For God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. And as under the Law the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile withall in the holy place; so it pleased the Father, having made peace by the blood of his crosse, by him to reconcile all things unto himself. And thus it comes to passe, that us who were enemies in our mind by wicked works, yet now have been reconciled in the body of his flesh through death. And upon this reconciliation of our persons must necessarily follow the salvation of our souls. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. Furthermore, we were all at first en-

Joh. 3. 17.

Heb. 9. 22,
23, 26.

Mat. 26. 28.

1 Pet. 2. 24.

Col. 1. 14.

Rom. 5. 8, 9.

1 Sam. 29. 4.

2 Cor. 5. 19.

Col. 1. 20,
21, 22.

Rom. 5. 10.

Lev. 25. 49.

Lev. 25. 48.

Mat. 20. 28.

1 Tim. 2. 6.

Eph. 1. 7.

1 Pet. 1. 18,
19.

Neb. 8. 25.

slav'd by sin, and brought into captivity by Satan, neither was there any possibility of escape but by way of Redemption. Now it was the Law of *Moses*, that if *any were able he might redeem himself*: but this to us was impossible, because absolute obedience in all our actions is due unto God, and therefore no act of ours can make any satisfaction for the least offence. Another law gave yet more liberty, that he which *was sold might be redeem'd again, one of his brethren might redeem him*. But this in respect of all the mere sons of men was equally impossible, because they were all under the same captivity. Nor could they satisfy for others, who were wholly unable to redeem themselves. Wherefore there was no other brother, but that Son of man which is the Son of God, who was like unto us in all things, sin onely excepted, which could work this redemption for us. And what he onely could, that he freely did perform. *For the Son of man came to give his life a ranfome for many*: and as he came to give, so he gave himself a ranfome for all. So that in him *we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins*. For we are bought with a price, for we are redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lambe without blemish and without spot. He then which hath obtained for us remission of sins, he who through himself hath reconciled us unto God, he who hath given himself as a ranfome to redeem us, he who hath thus wrought out the way of salvation for us, must necessarily have a second and a farre higher right unto the name of *Jesus*, unto the title of our *Saviour*.

Thirdly, beside the promulging and procuring, there is yet a further act, which is conferring of salvation on us. All which we mentioned before, was wrought by vertue of his death, and his appearance in the Holy of holies: but we must still believe, *he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth*

to make intercession for them. For now being set down at the right hand of God, he hath received all power both in heaven and earth; and the end of this power which he hath received is to conferre salvation upon those which believe in him. For the Father gave the Son *this power over all flesh, that he should give eternall life to as many as he hath given him*; that he should raise our bodies out of the dust, and cause our corruptible to put on incorruption, and our mortall to put on immortality: and upon this power we are to expect salvation from him. For we must look for the Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself. And unto them that thus look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation. Being then we are all to endeavour that our spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus, being S. Peter hath taught us, that God hath exalted Christ with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, being the conferring of that upon us which he promised to us, and obtained for us, is the reward of what he suffered; therefore we must acknowledge that the actuall giving of salvation to us, is the ultimate and conclusive ground of the title *Saviour*. Thus by the vertue of his precious blood Christ hath obtained remission of our sins, by the power of his grace hath taken away the dominion of sin, in the life to come will free us from all possibility of sinning, and utterly abolish death the wages of sin: wherefore well said the Angel of the Lord, *thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins*; well did Zacharias call him *an horn of salvation*, Simeon *the salvation of God*, S. Paul *the captain and authour of eternall salvation*, S. Peter *a Prince & a Saviour*, correpsondent to those of Israel, raised up by God himself to deliver his people from the hands of their enemies, and for that reason called

Joh. 17. 2.

Phil. 3. 20. 21.

Heb. 9. 28.

1 Cor. 5. 5.

Act. 5. 31.

Mat. 1. 21.

Luk. 1. 69.

2. 30.

Heb. 5. 9. 2. 10.

Act. 5. 31.

Neb. 9. 27.

Saviours. In the time of their trouble, say the Levites, when they cried unto thee, thou heardest them from heaven, and according to thy manifold mercies thou gavest them Saviours, who saved them out of the hand of their enemies.

Eccles. 46. 1.

The correspondency of *Jesus* unto those temporall *Saviours* will best appear, if we consider it particularly in *Josuah*, who bare that salvation in his name, and approved it in his actions. For as the son of *Sirach* saith, *Jesus the son of Nave was valiant in the warres, and was the successour of Moses in prophesies, who according to his name was made great for the saving of the elect of God.*

Act. 7. 35.

Although therefore *Moses* was truly and really a ruler and deliverer, which is the * same with *Saviour*, although

* Hefych. Ρύτης, σωτήρ, λυτρωτής. and again, Σωτήρ, ὁ τοῦ, ὁ ἐλευθέρου, ἢ λυτρωτής.

† Quantum attinet ad propheticum apparatus, nec gerit nec dici aliquid possit insignis, quandoquidem res perditur est usque nominis expressionem, s. Aug. contra Faustum, 16. 19.

¶ Οὐ πρόπον ἐκείνος εἰσὶν ἡ γὰρ εἰς τὴν

ἀρίαν γῆν τὸν λαόν, ἐξ ἡ Μωσῆς ὡς ἐκεῖνος ὁ κληρὸν διένειμεν αὐτὸν τοῖς εἰσὶν αὐτῷ ἔτι καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπιστρέψεν καὶ διαμεμεῖν τὴν ἀγαθὴν γῆν ἐπέστω. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph.

them

them in *Canaan*. *Josuah* the successor onely could effect that in which *Moses* failed. Now nothing is more frequent in the phrase of the Holy Ghost, then to take *Moses* for the doctrine deliver'd, or the books written by him, that is the * Law; from whence it followeth, that the death of *Moses* and the succession of *Josuah* prefignified the continuance of the law till *Jesus* came, ^a by whom all that believe are justified from all things, from which we could not be justified by the law of *Moses*.

* As *Luk.* 16, 29, 31. 24, 27. *Joh.* 5. 45, 46. *Act.* 6. 11. collated with the 13. verse. *Act.*

15, 21. 21, 21.

2 *Cor.* 3. 15. Μωσῆς κοιτέον τὸν νόμον, Ἰησοῦς τὸν ὁμῶνυμον ἐκείνου. ὡς περ τοίνυν κατὰ τὴν ἰσοειδίαν Μωσῆ τέτελεσται, Ἰησοῦς τὸν λαὸν εἰς τὴν ἐπιγγελημένην εἰσάγει ζῆν· ἔτι μετὰ τὸ τῶ νόμου τέλος ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐμφανείσθαι. Ἰησοῦς ἀνέωξε τὴν εὐαγγελίᾳ λαῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. *Theodoret.* in *Jos.* *Proem.* Cum successor *Moyſi* destinaretur *Aufis* filius *Nave*, transferretur certe de pristino nomine, & incipit vocari *Jesus*. Certe, inquis. Hanc prius dicimus figuram futuri fuisse. Nam quia *Jesus Christus* secundum populum quod sumus nos nationes in seculi deserto commorantes antea, introducturus esset in terram repromissionis melle & lacte manantem, id est, in vitæ æternæ possessionem, quæ nihil dulcius, idque non per *Moyſen*, id est, non per legis disciplinam, sed per *Jesusum*, id est, per novæ legis gratiam provenire habebat, circumcisis nobis petrina acie, id est, Christi præceptis, (petra enim *Christus* multis modis & figuris prædicatus est;) ideo is vir qui in hujus Sacramenti imagine parabatur, etiam nominis *Dominici* inauguratus est figura, ut *Jesus* nominaretur. *Tertul.* *adv. Judæos*, c. 9. & *adv. Marcion.* l. 3. c. 16. Idcirco *Moyſi* etiam succedit, ut ostenderet novam legem per *Jesusum Christum* datam, veteri legi succeduram, quæ data per *Moyſen* fuit. *Lact.* de *Vera Sap.* l. 4. c. 17. In cujus comparatione (*Moyſes*) improbarus est, ut non ipse introduceret populum in terram promissionis; ne videlicet lex per *Moyſen*, non ad salvandum sed ad convincendum peccatorem data, in regnum cælorum introducere putaretur, sed gratia & veritas per *Jesusum Christum* facta. S. *Aug.* contra *Manſum*, l. 16. c. 19. *Jesus* dux qui populum eduxerat de *Ægypto*, *Jesus* qui interpretatur *Salvator*, *Moyſe* mortuo & sepulto in *Moab*, hoc est, *Lege* mortuo, in *Evangelium* cupit inducere populum suum. S. *Hieron.* in *Psal.* 86. a *Act.* 13. 39.

The Law and the Prophets were untill *John*, since that the kingdome of God is preached. *Moses* must die, that *Josuah* may succeed: by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified (for by the law is the knowledge of sin;) but the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of *Jesus*

Luk. 16. 16.
Rom. 3. 20,
21, 22.

Exod. 24. 13.

† *Moses in nubem intravit, ut opera & occulta cognosceret, adhaerente sibi secio Jesu, quia nemo sine eo Jesu potest incerta sapientiarum & occultarum comprehendere. Et ideo in specie Jesu Nave veri Salvatoris significabatur a futura praesentia, per quem fierent omnes docibiles Dei, qui*

legem aperiret, Evangelium revelaret. S. Ambros. in Psal. 47. a Jos. 5. 2.

* *Non enim propheta sic ait, Et dixit Dominus ad me; sed, ad Jesum: ut ostenderet quod non de se loqueretur, sed de Christo, ad quem cum Deus loquebatur. Christi enim figuram gerebat ille Jesus. Lact. l. 4. c. 17. b Rom. 2. 29. c Col. 2. 11.*

Ex. 24. 13.

Jos. 1. 1.

Rom. 15. 8.

Job. 1. 17.

Jesus Christ unto all & upon all them that believe. Moses indeed seems to have taken Josuah with him up into the mount; but if he did, sure it was to enter the cloud which covered the mount where the glory of the Lord abode:

*for without Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, there is no looking into the secrets of heaven, no approaching to the presence of God. The command of circumcision was not given unto Moses, but to Josuah; nor were the Israelites circumcised in the wilderness, under the conduct of Moses and Aaron, but in the land of Canaan, under their Successour. a For at that time the Lord said unto Josuah, make thee sharp knives, and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time. Which I speaketh * Jesus to be the true circumciser, the authour of another circumcision, then that of the flesh commanded by the law, b even the circumcision of the heart in the spirit, and not in the letter; that which c is made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which is therefore called the circumcision of Christ.*

Thus if we look upon Josuah as the minister of Moses, he is even in that a type of Christ, the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God. If we look on him as the successour of Moses, in that he representeth Jesus, in as much as the law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. If we look on him as now Judge and Ruler of Israel, there is scarce an action which is not clearly predictive of our Saviour. He begins his office at the banks of * Jordan, where Christ is baptized, and en-

* πύπιν δὲ

ἐρεπεν αὐτῷ ὁ

τῷ Ναυῇ Ἰησοῦς καὶ πολλὰ ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ ὃ δὲ χεῖν τῷ λαῷ ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ὅθεν καὶ Χριστὸς βαπτισθεὶς ἤρξατο ἐκκαθαρίζειν. S. Syril. Catech. 10.

ters

tersupon his prophetical office. He chuseth there twelve men out of the people, to carry twelve stones over with them; as our *Jesus* thence began to chuse his * twelve Apostles, those foundation-stones in the Church of God, whose ^a names are in the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy city, the new Jerusalem. It hath been observed, that the saving *Rahab* the harlot alive, foretold what *Jesus* once should speak to the Jews, ^b Verily I say unto you, that the Publicans and Harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. ^c He said in the sight of Israel, Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon: and the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to go down about a whole day. Which great miracle was not onely wrought by the power of him whose name he bare, but did also signify that in the later dayes, toward the setting of the Sun, when the light of the world was tending unto a night of darknesse, the Sun of righteousness should arise with healing in his wings, and giving a check to the approaching night, become ^d the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

* S. Cyril ad-
deih that he di-
vided the land
by twelve men.
δωδεκα δὲ δι-
αιρῶνται τὴν
κληρονομίαν
καθίστησι ὁ τῆ
Ναυῆ υἱὸς καὶ
δωδεκα τῆς
Ἀποστόλων κή-
ρυκας τῆς ἀ-
ληθείας εἰς
πάντων τὴν οἰ-
κουμένην ἀπο-
στέλλει ὁ Ἰη-
σοῦς. lb.

a Revel. 21. 14.

b Mat. 21. 31.

c Jos. 10.

12, 13.

d Joh. 1. 9.

† by the same

S. Cyril. πρεῦσπον Παῦλ τὴν πόρνην ἔσωσεν ὁ τυπικός· ὁ δὲ ἀληθὴς φησιν, ἵνα οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι παραγῶσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. I Sctit Sol, quia in *Jesu* & typum tuturi agnoscebat & nomen. Neque enim in sua virtute *Jesu Nave*, sed in Christi mysterio coelestibus luminibus imperabat. Designabatur enim Dei filium in hoc seculum esse venturum, qui mundani luminis concidentis & jam vergentis in tenebras virtute divina differret occasum, lucem redderet, inveharet claritatem. S. Ambros. Apolog. David. poster. c. 4. Ille imperavit soli ut staret, & stetit, & istius typo ille magnus erat. Ille imperabat, sed Dominus efficiebat. S. Hieron. in Psal. 76.

But to passe by more particulars, *Josuah* smote the *Amalekites*, and subdued the *Canaanites*; by the first making way to enter the land; by the second giving possession of it. And *Jesus* our Prince and Saviour, whose kingdom was not of this world, in a spirituall manner goeth in and out before us against our spirituall enemies, subduing sin and Satan, and so opening and clearing our way

to

to heaven; destroying the last enemy, death, so giving us possession of eternall life. Thus do we believe the man called *Jesus*, to have fulfilled in the highest degree imaginable, all which was but typified in him who first bare the name, and in all the rest which succeeded in his office, and so to be the
Luk. 1. 69, 71. Saviour of the world, *whom God hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, that we should be saved from our enemies, and the hands of all that hate us.*

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article is not onely certain, but evident: because there is no end of faith without a Saviour, and no other name but this by which we can be saved, and no way to be saved by him, but by believing in him. For *this is his commandment,*
1 Job. 3. 23, 24. *that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ: and he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him.* From him then, and from him alone must we expect salvation, acknowledging and confessing freely, there is nothing in our selves which can effect it, or deserve it for us, nothing in any other creature which can promerit or procure it to us. For *there is but one God, and one Mediatour between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* 'Tis onely the beloved Son in whom God is well pleased; he is clothed with a vesture dipt in blood, he hath trod the wine-presse alone: we like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. By him God hath reconciled all things to himself, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven. By him alone is our salvation wrought: for his sake then onely can we ask it, from him alone expect it.

Secondly, this Belief is necessary, that we may delight and rejoyce in the name of *Jesus*, as that in which all our happinesse is involv'd. At his nativity an Angel from heaven thus taught the shepherds, the first witnesses of the blessed incarnation; *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day*
Luk. 2. 10, 11.

day in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And what the Angel delivered at present, that the Prophet *Isaiah*, that old Evangelist, foretold at distance. When the people which walked in darknesse should see a great light, when unto us a child should be born, unto us a son should be given; then should they joy before God, according to the joy of harvest, and as men rejoyce when they divide the spoil. When God shall come with recompense, when he shall come and save us; *Is. 9. 2, 3, 6.* then the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads. *Is. 35. 4, 10.*

Thirdly, the belief in *Jesus* ought to inflame our affection, to kindle our love toward him, ingaging us to hate all things in respect of him, that is, so farre as they are in opposition to him, or pretend to equall share of affection with him. He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me, saith our Saviour; so forbidding all prelation of any naturall affection, because our spirituall union is farre beyond all such relations. Nor is a higher degree of love onely debarr'd us, but any equall pretension is as much forbidden. If any man come to me, saith the same Christ, and hate not his father & mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yet and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. *Mat. 10. 37.* Is it not this *Jesus*, in whom the love of God is demonstrated to us, and that in so high a degree as is not expressible by the pen of man? God so loved the world, that he gave his onely begotten Son. Is it not he, who shew'd his own love unto us, farre beyond all possibility of parallell? for greater love hath no man then this, that a man lay down his life for his friends; but while we were yet sinners, that is enemies, Christ died for us, and so became our *Jesus*. Shall thus the Father shew his love in his Son, shall thus the Son shew his love in himself, and shall we no way study a requital? or is there any proper return of love but love? *Joh. 3. 16.* *Joh. 15. 13.* *Rom. 5. 8.*

Cant. 2, 7. 3, 5.
8, 4.
* ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ
ἐσαύρωται.

1 Cor. 16. 22.

Phil. 3. 8.

Iob. 14. 15.

1 Iob. 5. 3.

Mat. 8. 27.

Mark 9. 38.

Luk. 9. 49.

Act. 19. 15.

Philip. 2. 8.

The voice of the Church, in the language of *Solomon* is *my love*: nor was that onely the exprestion of a spouse, but of * *Ignatius*, a man, after the Apostles, most remarkable. And whosoever considereth the infinite benefits to the sons of men flowing from the actions and sufferings of their Saviour, cannot chuse but conclude with *S. Paul*, *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.*

Lastly, the confession of faith in *Jesus* is necessary to breed in us a correspondent esteem of him, & an absolute obedience to him. That we may be raised to the true temper of *S. Paul*, who counted all things but losse for the excellency of the knowledge of *Christ Jesus our Lord*, for whom he suffered the losse of all things, and counted them but dung that he might win *Christ*. Nor can we pretend to any true love of *Jesus*, except we be sensible of the readinesse of our obedience to him: as knowing what language he used to his disciples, *If ye love me, keep my commandments*; and what the Apostle of his bosome spake, *This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments*. His own disciples once marvelled, and said, *What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him*? How much more should we wonder at all disobedient Christians, saying, *What manner of men are these, who refuse obedience unto him, whom the senselesse creatures, the winds and the sea obeyed*? Was the name of *Jesus* at first sufficient to cast out devils; and shall man be more refractory then they? Shall the *exorcist* say to the evil spirit, *I adjure thee by the name of Jesus*, and the devil give place? Shall an Apostle speak unto us in the same name, and we refuse? Shall they obey that name which signifieth nothing unto them; for he took not on him the nature of *Angels*, and so is not their Saviour; and can we deny obedience unto him, who took on him the seed of *Abraham*, and became obedient to death, even the death of the crosse for us, that he might be raised to full power, and absolute dominion.

dominion over us, and by that power be enabled at last to save us, and in the mean time to rule and govern us, and exact the highest veneration from us? For God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. *Philip. 2. 9. 10.*

Having thus declared the Originall of the name *Jesus*, the means and wayes by which he which bare it, expressed fully the utmost signification of it; we may now clearly deliver, and every particular Christian easily understand what it is he saies, when he makes his confession in these words, *I believe in Jesus*, which may be not unfitly in this manner described. I believe not onely that there is a God who made the world; but I acknowledge and professe that I am fully perswaded of this, as of a certain and infallible truth, that there was and is a man, whose name by the ministry of an Angel was called *Jesus*, of whom particularly *Josuah* the first of that name, and all the rest of the Judges and Saviours of *Israel* were but types. I believe that *Jesus*, in the highest and utmost importance of that name, to be the Saviour of the world; inasmuch as he hath revealed to the sons of men the onely way for the salvation of their souls, and wrought the same way out for them by the vertue of his blood; obtaining remission for sinners, making reconciliation for enemies, paying the price of redemption for captives; and shall at last himself actually conferre the same salvation, which he hath promulged and procured, upon all those which unfeignedly and stedfastly believe in him. I acknowledge there is no other way to heaven beside that which he hath shewn us, there is no other means which can procure it for us but his blood, there is no other person which shall conferre it on us but himself. And with this full acknowledgement, *I believe in Jesus*.

ordinary termination, ΝΗΥΩ is turn'd into Μεωία. That this was the Greek Χριστός; and the Latine Christus is evident; and yet the Latines living at a distance, strangers to the customs of the Jewes, and the doctrine of the Christians, mistook this name, and call'd him Chrestus, from the Greek χρεστός. So Suetonius in the life of Claudius, c. 25. Judæos impullore Chrestus assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit, which was not onely his mistake, but generally the Romans at first as they named him Chrestus, so they called us Chrestians. Tertul. adv. Gentes. Sed & cum perperam Chrestianus pronunciatur à vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Lactant. l. 4. c. 17. Sed exponenda huius nominis ratio est propter ignorantium errorem, qui cum immutata litera Christum solent dicere. Upon which mistake Justine Martyr justifies the Christians of his time, ἐπεὶ ὁ ὅς γε ἐκ τοῦ καθηρομένου ἡμῶν ὀνόματος, χριστάτοι ὑπάρχομεν. And again, Χριστιανοὶ (or rather Χρηστιανοὶ) ἵδ' εἶναι καθηρομένα· τὸ δὲ χρεστὸν μισθὸς ἔστι σωτηρίας. Apol. 2. I. was then the ignorance of the Jewes affairs which caused the Romans to name our Saviour Chrestus, and the true title is certainly Christus. Χριστός μιν, καὶ τὸ καχρίστὸς, saith Justine. τὸ τῷ Χριστῷ ὄνομα πατρὸς Μωϋσῆ τοῖς χριστομένοις ἐπιτείνειν, sayes Euseb. Dem. Evang. l. 4. c. 14. Quoniam Græci veteres χρίστους dicebant ungi. quod nunc ἀλείφουσιν, ob hanc rationem nos eum Christum nuncupamus, id est unctum, qui Hebraice Messias dicitur; Lact. l. 4. c. 7. So the Latines generally Christus à chrismate: and without question χριστός is from χρίω. Yet I conceive the first signification of this word among the Greeks hath not been yet sufficiently discovered. The first of the ancients in whom I meet with the word χριστός is Æschylus the Tragedian, in whom I find it had another sense then now we take it in; for in his language that is not χρίσθαι which is anointed, but that with which it is anointed; so that it signifieth not the subject of unction, but the ointment as diffused in the subject. The place is this in his Prometheus Vincens.

’Ουκ ἦν ἀλέχημ’ ἐδέν, ἐδὲ βρώσιμον,
 ’Ου χρίσθον, ἐδὲ πῖσθον, ἀλλὰ φαρμάκων
 Χρητὰ κατεσκέλλοντο.---

Prometheus shews himself to be the inventor of the art of Physick; that before him therefore there was no medicine, neither to be taken internally by eating or by drinking, nor externally by way of inunction, as the Scholiast very well expounds it. ἐκ ἦν ἐδέν βρώσιμα διεσπείλαι, ἐδὲ διὰ βρώσιως προσφερόμενον, (which is ἐδὲ βρώσιμον in Æschylus) ἔτε δὲ δι’ ἐπιχρίσιως ἔχον (which is ἐ χρίσθον) ἐδὲ διὰ πόσιως (τῆτο δὲ διλοῖ τὸ πῖσθον.) As therefore from πῖω πῖω, πῖσθον, so from χρίω χρίω, χρίσθον. and as πῖσθον is not that which receiveth drink, but that drink which is received, not quod potat, but quod potabile est; so χρίσθον is not that which receiveth oyl, but that which is receiv’d by inunction. So the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, Τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μὲν ὄχι καταπλάσαι, τὰ δὲ χρίσαι, τὰ δὲ ποτῆσαι. and the Scholiast of Theocritus, Ἰστέον ὅτι τῶν φαρμάκων τὰ μὲν εἰσι χρίσαι, ἡ γυν, ἀπὸς χρίσθαι εἰς διεσπείλαι· τὰ δὲ ποτῆσαι, ἡ γυν, ἀπὸς πῖωμεν τὰ δὲ καταπλάσαι, ἡ γυν, ἀπὸς ἐπιπῖωμεν. Idyl. 11. So that χρίσθον in his judgement is the same with χρίσθον in Theocritus.

Οὐδὲν ποτὶδὲν ἔρῳα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
 Νικία, ἔτ' ἔγχετον, ἐμὴν δοκῆ, ἔτ' ἐπ' ἴπασον
 Ἡ ταὶ Πίειδες.-----

In the same sense with Æschylus did Euripides use *χεῖδον φάρμακον*. and not onely those ancient Poets, but even the later Oratour: as in Chryostomus. πολλοὶ δὲ χεῖρον καὶ διαφθαμένους σώματα καὶ νοσήσας ψυχὰς διαφθαμένῃ, καὶ Δι', ἔχοντες φαρμάκων χεῖδων ἢ ποτῶν. Orat. 78. and the LXX have us'd it in this sense; as when the Hebrew speaks of *חַיָּוֹן* oleum unctionis, they translate it τὸ ἐπιχεχρμένον ἐπὶ τῷ κεφαλῇ τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῷ χεῖδῳ, Levit. 21. 10. and again vers. 12. *חַיָּוֹן* ὅτι τὸ ἄγιον ἔλαιον τὸ χεῖδον ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Oleum unctionis then is *ἐλαίον χεῖδον*, which in Exodus 29. 7. 35. 13. 40. 9. the same Translatours correspondent to the Hebrew phrase call *ἐλαίον χείσματος*, and more frequently *ἐλαίον χείσεως*. But although it appear from hence that the first use of the word *χεῖς* among the Greeks was to signify the act or matter used in unction, not the subject or person anointed; yet in the vulgar acception of the LXX it was most constantly receiv'd for the person anointed, of the same validity with *χεῖδης* or *κεχεισμένος*. Suidas *χεῖς*, ὁ κεχεισμένος ἐν ἐλαίῳ. as also with *ἡλειμμένος*. For though Lactantius in the place fore-cited seem to think that word an improper version of the Hebrew *חַיָּוֹן*. unde in quibusdam Græcis scripturis, quæ male de Hebraicis interpretatæ sunt, *ἡλειμμένος*, id est, unguento curatus, scriptum invenitur, ἀπὸ τῷ ἀλείφειν; yet the LXX have so translated it, Num. 3. 3. οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ ἡλειμμένοι. And although Athenæus hath observed, ὅς μύρων τὰ μὲν εἰς χείσματος, τὰ δ' ἀλείμματα. yet in the vulgar use of the words there is no difference, as he himself speaks a little after. τὸ δὲ χεῖσαι τὸ τοῖστω ἀλείμματι μυεῖσαι δὲ ἴσμεν. So Hesych. ἀλείφαι, ἐλαίῳ χεῖσαι. and Suidas, ἡλημμένον, ἐχειμμένον. *Χεῖς* then in the vulgar use of the LXX is a person anointed, and in that sense is our Saviour called Christ.

spel in the Greek as the most generall language in those dayes: and the signification of them both is, the Anointed. S. Paul and the rest of the Apostles writing in that language, used the Greek name, which the Latines did retain, calling him constantly *Christus*, and we in English have retain'd the same, as universally naming him *Christ*.

Nor is this yet the full interpretation of the word, which is to be understood not simply according to the action onely, but as it involveth the design in the custome of anointing. For in the Law whatsoever was anointed, was thereby set apart, as ordained to some speciall use or office; and therefore under the notion of unction, we must understand that

that promotion and ordination. *Jacob poured oyl on the Gen. 28. 18.*
top of a pillar, and that anointing was the consecration of
 it. *Moses* anointed the Tabernacle and all the Vessels,
 and this anointing was their dedication. Hence the *Priest*
that is anointed signifieth in the phrase of *Moses* the High
 Priest, because he was invested in that office at and by his
 unction. When therefore *Jesus* is call'd the *Messias* or
Christ, and that so long after the anointing oil had ceased,
 it signified no lesse then a Person set apart by God, a-
 nointed with most sacred oil, advanced to the highest
 office, of which all those employments under the Law, in
 the obtaining of which oil was us'd, were but types and
 shadows.

That there was among the Jewes an expectation of
 such a *Christ* to come, is most evident. The woman of
Samaria could speak with confidence, *I know that Messias* *Joh. 4. 25.*
cometh. And the unbelieving Jewes, who will not ac-
 knowledge that he is already come, expect him still. Thus
 we find *all men musing in their hearts of John, whether he* *Luk 3. 15.*
were the Christ or not. When *Jesus* taught in the Tem-
 ple, those which doubted, said, *When Christ cometh, no man* *Joh. 7. 27.*
knoweth whence he is; those which believed, said, *When*
Christ cometh, will he do moe miracles then these which *31.*
this man hath done? Whether therefore they doubted, or
 whether they believed in *Jesus*, they all expected a *Christ*
 to come; and the greater their opinion was of him, the more
 they believed he was that *Messias*. *Many of the people said,* *40.*
of a truth this is the Prophet: others said, this is the Christ. *41.*
 As soon as *John* began to baptize, the Jewes sent *Priests*
and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, who art thou? *Joh. 1. 19.*
 that is, whether he were the *Christ*, or no, as appear-
 eth out of his answer. *And he confessed and de-* *20.*
nied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ. For
 as they asked him after, *What then? art thou Elias?*
and he said, I am not. art thou that Prophet? and
he answered, no: So without question their first de-
 mand

† So Nonnus
hath expressed,
what in the E-
vangelist is to
be understood.
Μυστήριον δ'
ἀρέσκον ὁ μὴ
λυδὲς ὁξεί
μυθῶ, τίς ὧ
πίλει; μὴ Χει-
ρὸς ἔρως;
* Author Se-
pher Ikkarim,
l. 4. c. ult.
Maimon.
Tract. de Regi-
bus. c. 11.
a Gen. 21. 12.
b Gal. 3. 16.

Mat. 3. 22.

Dan. 9. 26.

mand was, † art thou the *Christ*? and he answered, I am not. From whence it clearly appeareth that there was a generall expectation among the Jewes of a *Messias* to come; nor onely so, but it was alwayes counted amongst them an * article of their faith, which all were obliged to believe who professed the law of *Moses*, and whosoever denied that, was thereby interpreted to deny the Law and the Prophets. Wherefore it will be worth our enquiry to look into the grounds upon which they built that expectation. It is most certain that the *Messias* was promised by God, both before, and under the Law. God said unto *Abram*, a *In Isaac shall thy seed be called.* and we know that was a promise of a *Messias* to come, because S. Paul hath taught us, b *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not unto seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.* The Lord said unto *Moses*, I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee. And S. Peter hath sufficiently satisfied us, that this Prophet promised to *Moses*, is *Jesus the Christ*. Many are the prophecies which concern him, many promises which are made of him; but yet some of them very obscure, others though plainer, yet have relation onely to the person, not to the notion or the word *Messias*. Wheresoever he is spoken of as the Anointed, it may well be first understood of some other person; except one place in *Daniel*, where *Messiah is foretold to be cut off*: and yet even there the Greek Translation hath not the *Messiah*, but the *Unction*. It may therefore seem something strange, how so universall an expectation of a Redeemer under the name of the *Messias* should be spread through the Church of the Jewes. But if we consider that in the space of seventy yeares of the Babylonish captivity, the ordinary Jewes had lost the exact understanding of the old Hebrew language before spoken in *Judea*, and therefore when the Scriptures were read unto them, they found it necessary to interpret them to the people in the Chaldee

Chaldee language which they had lately learn'd. As when *Ezra* the Scribe brought the book of the Law of *Moses* before the Congregation; the Levites are said to have caused the people to understand the Law, because *they read in the book, in the Law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading.* *Nehem. 8. 8.*

Which constant interpretation begat at last a Chaldee Translation of the Old Testament to be read every Sabbath in the Synagogues; And that being not exactly made word for word with the Hebrew, but with a liberty of a brief exposition by the way, took in together with the Text, the generall opinion of the learned Jewes. By which means it came to passe that not onely the doctrine, but the name also of the *Messias* was very frequent and familiar with them. Insomuch that even in the Chaldee Paraphrase now extant, there is expresse mention of the *Messias* in above seventy places, beside that of *Daniel*. The Jewes then informed by the plain words of *Daniel*, instructed by a constant interpretation of the Law and the Prophets read in their Synagogues every Sabbath-day, relying upon the infallible predictions and promises of God, did all unanimously expect out of their own Nation, of the Tribe of *Judah*, of the Family of *David*, a *Messias* or a *Christ* to come.

Now this being granted, as it cannot be denied, our next consideration is of the Time in which this promise was to be fulfill'd: which we shall demonstrate out of the Scriptures to be past, and consequently that the promised *Messias* is already come. The prediction of *Jacob* on his death-bed is clear and pregnant: *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, untill Shiloh come, and to him shall the gathering of the people be.* *Gen. 49. 10.* But the sceptre is departed from *Judah*, neither is there one Law-giver left between his feet, therefore *Shiloh*, that is the *Messias*, is already come. That the Jewish government hath totally fail'd, is not without the great

est folly to be denied, and therefore that *Shiloh* is already come, except we should deny the truth of divine predictions, must be granted. There remains then nothing to be proved, but that by *Shiloh* is to be understood the *Messias*;

* For instead of

עד כי יבא

Onkelos

renders it, עד

דחתי משיחא

and Jonathan

and the Jerusa-

lem Targum, עד

דחתי

מלכא

משיחא.

Beside the Ca-

balists did ge-

nerally so inter-

pret it, because

עד כי יבא

according to

their computa-

tion make the

same number

with the letters

of משיח, and

in the Talmud,

Cod. Sanhedrim

Rabbi Johanan

asking what

was the name

of the Messias,

they of the

School of R.

Schila answer,

עד כי יבא

his

name is Shiloh,

according to

that which is

written, untill

Shiloh come.

a If. 11. 10.

b Mic. 4. 1.

c Gen. 49. 8.

which is sufficiently manifest both from the consent of the ancient Jewes, and from the description immediately added to the name. For * all the old Paraphrasts call him

expressly the *Messias*, and the words which follow, *to him shall the gathering of the people be*, speak no lesse; as giving an explication of his person, office, or condition, who was but darkly described in the name of *Shiloh*. For this is the same character by which he was signified unto

Abraham, *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*, by which he is deciphered in *Isaiah*; ^a *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an*

ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious. and in *Micah*, ^b *The mountain of*

the house of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and peo-

ple shall flow unto it. And thus the blessing of *Judah* is plainly intelligible. ^c *Judah, thou art he whom thy bre-*

thren shall praise, thy hand shall be in the neck of thine ene-

mies, thy fathers children shall bow down before thee. Thou shalt obtain the primogeniture of thy brother *Reuben*,

and by vertue thereof shalt rule over the rest of the Tribes, the government shall be upon thy shoulders, and all thy brethren shall be subject unto thee. And that you

may understand this blessing is not to expire untill it make way for a greater, know that this government shall not

fail, untill there come a son out of your loynes, who shall be farre greater then your self: for whereas your dominion

reacheth onely over your brethren, and so is confin'd unto the tribes of *Israel*; his kingdome shall be universall, and all nations of the earth shall serve him. Being then this

Shiloh is so described in the text, and acknowledged by the ancient Jewes to be the *Messias*; being God had pro-

promised by *Jacob* the government of *Israel* should not fail untill *Shiloh* came; being that government is visibly and undeniably already fail'd; it followeth inevitably, that the *Messias* is already come.

In the same manner the Prophet *Malachy* hath given an expresse signification of the coming of the *Messias* while the temple stood. Behold, I will send my messenger, *Mal. 3. 1.* and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in. And *Haggai* yet more clearly; Thus saith the Lord of hosts, yet once it is a little while & I will shake the heavens, & the earth, *Hag. 2. 6, 7, 9.* and the sea, and the dry land; And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater then the glory of the former, saith the Lord of hosts. It is then most evident from these predictions, that the *Messias* was to come while the second Temple stood. It is as certain that the second Temple is not now standing. Therefore except we contradict the veracity of God, it cannot be denied but the *Messias* is already come. Nothing can be objected to enervate this argument, but that these prophecies concern not the *Messias*; and yet the ancient *Jewes* confess'd they did, and that they do so cannot be denied. For first, those titles, the *Angel of the Covenant*, the *delight of the Israelites*, the *desire of all nations*, are certain and known characters of the *Christ* to come. And secondly, it cannot be conceived how the glory of the second temple should be greater then the glory of the first, without the coming of the *Messias* to it. For the *Jewes* themselves have observed that five signes of the divine glory were in the first temple, which were wanting to the second: as the *Urim* and *Thummim*, by which the High Priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God; the *Ark of the Covenant*, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audi-

ble voice; the fire upon the Altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consum'd the sacrifices; the divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given as it were to the King and High Priest by anointing with the oyl of unction; and lastly, the spirit of Prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetick office were indued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure or building of it, as appeared by the teares dropt from those eyes which had beheld the former. *For many of the Priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice.* and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this prophecy, *Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?* Being then the structure of the second Temple was so far inferiour to the first, being all those signes of the divine glory were wanting in it, with which the former was adorned, the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, then by the coming of him into it, in whom all those signes of the divine glory were farre more eminently contained; and this person alone is the *Messias*. For he was to be the glory of the people *Israel*, yea even of the God of *Israel*; he the *Urim* and *Thummim*, by whom the will of God, as by a greater oracle was revealed; he the true Ark of the Covenant, the onely propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true fire which came down from heaven; he which was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and to dwell among us, that we might behold his glory; he who received the Spirit without measure, & from whose fulnesse we do all receive. In him were all those signes of the divine glory united, which were thus divided in the first temple; in him.

Ezr. 3. 12.

Hag. 2. 3.

him they were all more eminently contained then in those: therefore his coming to the second Temple was as the sufficient, so the onely means, by which the glory of it could be greater then the glory of the first. If then the *Messias* was to come while the second temple stood, as appeareth by Gods prediction and promise, if that temple many ages since hath ceas'd to be, there being not one stone left upon a stone, if it certainly were before the destruction of it in greater glory then ever the former was, if no such glory could accrue unto it but by the coming of the *Messias*; then is that *Messias* already come.

Having thus demonstrated out of the promises given to the Jewes, that the *Messias* who was so promised unto them must be already come, because those events which were foretold to follow his coming are already past, we shall proceed unto the next particular, and prove that the man *Jesus*, in whom we believe, is that *Messias* who was promised. First, it is acknowledged both by the Jew and Gentile, that this *Jesus* was born in *Judea*, and liv'd and died there before the Commonwealth of *Israel* was dispersed, before the second temple was destroyed, that is, at the very time when the Prophets foretold the *Messias* should come. And there was no other beside him that did with any shew of probability pretend to be, or was accepted as the *Messias*. Therefore we must confesse he was, and onely he could be the *Christ*. Secondly, all other prophecies belonging to the *Messias* were fulfilled in *Jesus*, whether we look upon the family, the place, or the manner of his birth, neither were they ever fulfilled in any person beside him; he then is, and no other can be the *Messias*. That he was to come out of the Tribe of *Judah*, and family of *David*, is every where manifest.

* The Jewes, which mention *Messias* as a son of *Joseph* or * The Jewes have invented a double *Messias*; to one they attribute all those places which mention his low estate and sufferings, to the other such as speak of his power and glory. The one they

וְהָיָה בֶן דָּוִד מְשִׁיחַ, the other בֶּן יוֹסֵף מְשִׁיחַ. The son of Joseph they name also the son of Ephraim, and the son of David the son of Judah, as the Targum Cant. 4. 5. Thy two breasts are like two young roes. בֶּן דָּוִד וּמְשִׁיחַ בֶּן יוֹסֵף מְשִׁיחַ. Two are thy redeemers, Messias the son of David, and Messias the son of Ephraim.

Is. 11. 1, 10.

* which the Chaldee Paraphrase thus translates,

וּפֶקֶד מְלָכָה

מִבְנוֹתָי דְּרוֹשִׁי

וּמְשִׁיחַ מִבְּנֵי

בְּנוֹתָי וְיִתְרַבִּי.

A king shall come of the sons of Jesse, and the Messias out of his sons sons.

a Rev. 5, 5.

22, 16.

b Mar. 12, 35.

c Mat. 22, 42.

d Mat. 12, 23.

e Mat. 21, 9.

Mat. 1, 1.

Heb. 7, 14.

Mat. 2, 4, 5.

of Ephraim, do not deny, but rather dignifie the Son of David or of Judah, whom they confesse to be the greater Christ. There shall come forth a * rod out of the stemme of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, saith the Prophet Isaiah. And again, In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious. Now who was it but Jesus, of whom the elders spake, a Behold the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David? who but he said, I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning starre? The Jewes did all acknowledge it, as appears by the question of our Saviour, b How say the Scribes that Christ is the son of David? c What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? they say unto him, the son of David. and that of the people amazed at the seeing of the blind, and speaking of the dumbe: d Is this the son of David? The blind cried out unto him, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on us; and the multitude cried e Hosanna to the son of David. The Genealogy of Jesus shews his family: the first words of the Gospel are, The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David. The prophecy therefore was certainly fulfill'd in respect of his lineage, for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah. Beside, if we look upon the place where the Messias was to be born, we shall find that Jesus by a particular act of providence was born there. When Herod gathered all the chief Priests and Scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born: and they said unto him, in Bethlehem of Juden. The people doubted whether Jesus was the Christ,

Christ, because they thought he had been born in Galilee where Joseph and Mary lived; wherefore they said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was? That place of Scripture which they meant was cited by the Scribes to Herod, according to the interpretation then current among the Jewes, and still preserved in the * Chaldee Paraphrase. For thus it is written in the Prophet, *a* And thou Bethlehem in the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of Juda, for out of thee shall come a governour that shall rule my people Israel. This prediction was most manifestly and remarkably fulfill'd in the birth of Jesus, when by the providence of God it was so order'd that Augustus should then tax the world, to which end every one should go up into his own city. Whereupon Joseph and Mary his espoused wife left Nazareth of Galilee their habitation, and went unto Bethlehem of Judea, the city of David, there to be taxed, *b* because they were of the house and lineage of David. And while they were there, as the dayes of the Virgin Mary were accomplished, so the prophecy was fulfill'd, for there she brought forth her first-born son, and so unto us was born that day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

But if we adde unto the family, and place, the manner of his birth also foretold, the argument must necessarily appear conclusive. The Prophet *Isaiah* spake thus unto the house of David; *The Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.* What nativity could be more congruous to the greatnesse of a Messias, then that of a Virgin, which is most miraculous? what name can be thought fitter for him then that of *Immanuel*, God with us, whose land Judea is said to be? The *Immanuel* then thus born of a Virgin was without question the true Messias. And we know Jesus was thus born of

* Which expressly translated it thus.

מִן־קִדְמוֹת
יִפְקֹד מִשְׁחָתָא
לְמַדְוֵי עַבְדֵּי
שׁוֹמְרֵי עֵל
יִשְׂרָאֵל

Out of thee shall come before me the Messias, that he may exercise domination in Israel.

a Mat. 2.5, 6.

b Luk. 2.4.

Luk. 2.11.

If. 7. 14.

If. 8. 8.

Mat. I. 22.

of the blessed Virgin Mary, that it might be fulfill'd which was thus spoken of the Lord by the Prophet. Wherefore being all the prophecies concerning the family, place, and manner of the birth of the *Messias* were fulfill'd in *Jesus*, and not so much as pretended to be accomplished in any other, it is again from hence apparent that this *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

Thirdly, he which taught what the *Messias* was to teach, did what the *Messias* was to do, suffered what the *Messias* was to suffer, and by suffering obtained all which a *Messias* could obtain, must be acknowledged of necessity to be the true *Messias*. But all this is manifestly true of *Jesus*. Therefore we must confesse he is the *Christ*. For first, it cannot be denied but the *Messias* was promised as a Prophet and Teacher of the people. So God promised him to *Moses*; I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee. So *Isaiah*, *Ezekiel*, and *Hoseah* have expressed him, as we shall hereafter have further occasion to shew. And not onely so, but as a greater Prophet, and more perfect Doctour, then ever any was which preceded him, more universall then they all.

Is. 42. I, 4.

I have put my spirit upon him, saith God, he shall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles, and the Isles shall wait for his law. Now it is as evident that *Jesus* of Nazareth

* ἀρχιποιμῆν,

1 Pet. 5. 4.

ὁ ποιμὴν τῆς

προβάτων ὁ

μὲγας. Heb.

13. 20. ὁ ποι-

μὴν καὶ ἐπίσκο-

πος τῆς ἑκ-

κλησίας. 1 Pet.

2. 25.

a Mat. 5. of ten.

b Mat. 7. 29.

was the most perfect Prophet, the * Prince and Lord of all the Prophets, Doctours, and Pastors, which either preceded or succeeded him. For he hath revealed unto us the most perfect will of God both in his precepts and his promises. He hath delivered the same after the most perfect manner, with the greatest authority, not like *Moses* and the Prophets, saying, *Thus saith the Lord*, but, *a I say unto you*: nor like the Interpreters of *Moses*, for *b he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes*: with the greatest perspicuity; not as those before him under types and shadowes, but plainly and clearly; from whence both he and his doctrine is frequently called

Light,

Light: with the greatest universality, as preaching that Gospel which is to unite all the Nations of the earth into one Church, that there might be one shepherd and one flock. Whatsoever then that great Prophet the *Messias* was to teach, that *Jesus* taught; and whatsoever works he was to do, those *Jesus* did.

When *John* the Baptist had heard the works of *Christ*, he sent two of his disciples with this message to him, *Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?* Mat. 11. 3.

And *Jesus* returned this answer unto him, shewing the ground of that message, *the works of Christ*, was a sufficient resolution of the question sent; *Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see. The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up.* And as *Jesus* alledged the works which he wrought to be a sufficient testimony that he was the *Messias*; so did those *Jewes* acknowledge it, who said, *When Christ cometh, Joh. 7. 31. will he do mo miracles then these which this man doth?*

And *Nicodemus* a Ruler among them confessed little lesse: *Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from Joh. 3. 2.*

God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Great and many were the miracles which *Moses* and the rest of the Prophets wrought for the ratification of the law, and the demonstration of Gods constant presence with his people; and yet all those wrought by so many severall persons in the space of above three thousand yeares, are farre short of those which this one *Jesus* did perform within the compasse of three yeares. The ambitious diligence of the *Jewes* hath reckon'd up seventy six miracles for *Moses*, and seventy four for all the rest of the Prophets. and supposing that they were so many, (though indeed they were not) how few are they in respect of those which are written of our Saviour! how inconsiderable if compar'd with all which he wrought, when *S. John* testifieth with as great certain-

Job. 21. 25.

Col. 2. 9.

Job. 5. 26.

Mark 5. 29.

Matt. 14.
34, 36.

Luk. 6. 17, 19.

Job. 11. 42.

Luk. 10. 19.

Mat. 10. 8.

ty of truth, as height of hyperbole, *that there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, he supposed that even the world it self could not contain the books that should be written!* Nor did our Saviour excell all others in the number of his miracles onely, but in the power of working. Whatsoever miracle *Moses* wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else consulting with God, receiv'd it by command from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as immanent or inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in *Jesus*, in whom dwelt all the fulnesse of the Godhead bodily, and to whom the father had given to have life in himself. This he sufficiently shewed by working with a word, by commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise: by working without a word or any intervenient sign; as when the woman which had an issue of blood twelve yeares touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up by the vertue which flowed out from the greater fountain of his power. And lest this example should be single, we find that the men of *Genesaret*, the people out of all *Judea* and *Jerusalem*, and from the sea-coast of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, even the whole multitude sought to touch him, for there went vertue out of him, and heal'd them all. Once indeed *Christ* seemeth to have pray'd before he raised *Lazarus* from the grave, but even that was done because of the people which stood by: not that he had not power within himself to raise up *Lazarus*, who was afterward to raise himself; but that they might believe the Father had sent him. The immanency and inherency of this power in *Jesus* is evident in this, that he was able to communicate it to whom he pleased, and actually did conferre it upon his disciples; Behold I give unto you power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: Upon the Apostles; Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise

raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give: Upon the first believers; These signes shall follow them that believe, in my name they shall cast out devils. He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works then these shall he do. He then which did more actions divine and powerfull then Moses and all the Prophets ever did, he which perform'd them in a manner farre more divine then that by which they wrought, hath done all which can be expected the *Messias*, foretold by them, should do.

Nor hath our *Jesus* onely done, but suffered all which the *Messias* was to suffer. For we must not with the Jews deny a suffering Christ, or fondly of our own invention make a double *Messias*, one to suffer and another to reign. It is clear enough by the Prophet *Isaias* what his condition was to be, whom he calls the *Servant of God*; and the later Jewes cannot deny but their † fathers constantly understood that place of the *Messias*.

Is. 52. 13.
† For first, instead of those words, Behold

my servant shall deal prudently; the Targum hath it plainly *הא יצליח עבדי משיחא* Behold my Son the *Messias* shall prosper. and Solomon Jarchi on the place, *רבותינו מוקמי לה במשיח* Our Rabbins understand this of the *Messias*. And the reason which he renders of their interpretation is very observable. For they say, says he, that the *Messias* is stricken, as it is written, He took our infirmities, and bare our griefs, which are the words of the 4. verse of the 53. chapter. From whence we may perceive how the ancients Jewes did joyn the later part of the 52. chap. with the 53. and expound them of the same person. Beside he cites a certain Midrash or Glasse, which attributes the same verse to the *Messias*, and that is to be found in Bereshit Rabba upon Gen. 28. 10. where falling upon that place in Zach. 4. 7. What art thou O great mountain before Zerubbabel: he answers; *ההוא גודל משיחא* that great mountain is the *Messias*. Then asking again, why doth he call the *Messias* a great mountain? he gives this answer, *שהוא גדול מן האבות שני הנה*, because he is greater then the Fathers, as it is written, behold my servant shall understand, that is, the *Messias*, which are the words of the verse before cited. And the same Bereshit Rabba, upon Gen. 24. 67. saith *Messias* the King was in the generation of the wicked, that he gave himself to seek for mercies for Israel, and to fasting and humbling himself for them, as it is written,

and so produceth the words of Isaiah 53. 5. From whence it appears again, that the Author thereof interpreted both the chapters of the same Messias. And further it is observable that the Midrash upon Ruth 2. 14. expounds the same verse in the same manner. And Rabbi Moses Alshech speaks yet more fully of the consent of the ancient Jewish Doctors upon this place *מלך כי על מלך* *המשיח ורבר.* behold our Doctors of happy memory conclude with one mouth, as they have received from their ancestors, that this is spoken of the Messias. From hence it appears that it was originally the generall sense of the Jewes, that all that piece of Isaiah is a description of the Messias, and consequently that the Apostles cannot be blamed by them now for applying it to Christ, and that the modern Jewes may well be suspected to frame their contrary expositions out of a wilfull opposition to Christianity.

Now the sufferings of Christ spoken of by the Prophet may be reduced to two parts; one in respect of contempt, by which he was despised of men, the other in respect of his death, and all those indignities and paines which preceded and led unto it. For the first the Prophet hath punctually describ'd his condition, saying, *He hath no form or comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men.* He * seems to describe a personage no way amiable, an aspect indeed rather uncomely: and so the most † ancient writers have interpreted *Isaias*, and confessed the fulfilling of it in the body of our Saviour. But what the aspect of his outward appearance was, because the Scriptures are silent,

If. 53. 2, 3.

* The first
לֹא תִמְצָא
seems to signify
no less, as
being from the
root תָּמַר
which signifies
to form,

figure, fashion, or delineate; from whence the noun attributed to any person, signifies the feature, complexion, shape, or composition of the body: as Rachel was *תְּמָרָה* *forma pulchra*, Gen. 29. 17. and so Joseph *וְיֹפֶה תִּמְרָה* Gen. 39. 6. so Abigail and Esther, and in generall Deut. 21. 11. with an addition of fair added to *תִּמְרָה*; whereas David is call'd without such addition *תִּמְרָה* *אֵלֶּם*, but with the full signification, *ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἁγνός*. In the 8. of Judges the 18. *וְיָמֵהוּ כְּתִמְרָה בְּנֵי* *תִּמְרָה*. *ὁ δὲ μελῶμα ὑπὲρ βασιλέως*. so the Roman; but the Aldus and Complut. better, *ὡς ἁγνός ὑπὲρ βασιλέως*. according to that verse of Euripides cited by Athenæus and Porphyrius, *Πρῶτον μὲν αἶδε' ἄξιον τυραννίδος*. The Messias was to be a King whose externall form and personage spake no such Majesty. † As Justine Martyr, *Ἐαδόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὅμι τὸν Ἰουδαῖον, καὶ νομιζομένου ἰσχυροῦ τῶν τέκτονος ὑπὲρ πάντων, καὶ ἀειδύς, ὡς αἱ γὰρ αἱ ἀκέρυσις, φανόμενα*. Dial. cum

Tryph. And Clemens Alex. Τὸν δὲ κύριον αὐτὸν τῶν ὀφιν αἰχρὸν γερονέναι
 διὰ Ἡοκίαν τὸ πνεῦμα μαρτυρεῖ· καὶ εἶδμεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐκ εἶχεν εἶδος, &c. Pæd. 2.
 c. 1. Ἐπει καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐν σαρκὶ μὲν αἰετῆς διεληλυθε
 καὶ ἀμορφος. Diom. 3. And Celsus impiously arguing against the descent of the
 Holy Ghost upon our Saviour, says it is impossible that any body, in which something
 of the divinity were, should not differ from others. οὗτο δὲ, the body of Christ,
 εἰδὲν ἄλλω διεέρεεν, ἀλλ', ὡς φασι, μικρὸν, καὶ δυσειδές, καὶ ἀγεννές ἦν. This which
 Celsus by his ὡς φασι seems to take from the common report of Christians in his age,
 Origen will have him take it out of Isaiah, and upon that acknowledge τὸ δυσει-
 δές, but the other two, μικρὸν and ἀγεννές, denies. Ὁμολογούμενος τοίνυν γε-
 γενηθῆναι τὰ περὶ τοῦ δυσειδούς γερονέναι τὸ Ἰησοῦ σῶμα, καὶ μὲν ὡς ἐκτέθειν, καὶ
 ἀγεννές, εἰδὲν σαφῶς δηλῶται ὅτι μικρὸν ἦν· ἔχει δὲ ἡ λέξις ἕτω παρὰ τῶν Ἡ-
 οκίαν ἀναγεγραμμένην, &c. and then cites this place, and so returns it as an an-
 swer to the argument of Celsus, that because he was foretold to be as he was, he
 must be the Son of God. μεγάλη κατασκευὴ ὅτι τὸ τὸν ἀμορφον δοκῶντα εἶναι
 Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν εἶναι θεοῦ, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐτῶν τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προφητεῖας καὶ
 ὅτι τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ. Orig. contra Celsum, p. 337, 338. In the same sense dia S.
 Cyril take these words of the Prophet; who speaking of those words of the Psalmist,
 speciosus forma præ filiis hominum, observes this must be understood of his divinity,
 κίωσις γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ταπεινότης τῆς μετὰ σαρκὸς οἰκονομίας ὅλον ἐστὶ τὸ μυστήρι-
 ον· γεγενῆσθαι δὲ καὶ ὁ Προφήτης Ἡοκίαν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐκ εἶχεν εἶδος, εἰδὲν κάλ-
 ος, &c. and again, ἐν εἰδὲν πύφηνεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ λίαν ἀκαλλεστῆρος. Tertullian
 speaks plainly as to the prophecy, and too freely in his way of expression: Sed carnis
 terrenæ non mira conditio ipsa erat quæ cætera ejus miranda faciebat, cum dicerent,
 unde huic doctrina hæc & signa ista? adeo nec humanæ honestatis corpus fuit, ne-
 dum cœlestis claritatis. Tacentibus apud nos quoque prophetis (Isai. 53. 2.) de
 ignobili aspectu ejus, ipsæ passiones ipsæque contumeliæ loquuntur. Passiones qui-
 dem humanam carnem, contumeliæ vero inhoneſtam probavere. An ausus esset ali-
 quis usque summo perstringere corpus novum, sputaminibus contaminare faciem
 nisi merentem? de Carne Christi, c. 9. And that we may be sure he pointed at that place
 in Isaiah, he saies that Christ was ne aspectu quidem honestus; Annuntiavimus enim,
 inquit, de illo sicut puerulus, sicut radix in terra sitienti, & non est species ejus neque
 gloria. Adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 17. & adv. Judæos, c. 14. This humility of Christ in taking
 upon him the nature of man without the ordinary ornaments of man, at first acknow-
 ledged, was afterwards denied, as appears by S. Hierome, on the 56. of Isaiah. In-
 glorius erit inter homines aspectus ejus, non quo formæ significat sorditatem, sed
 quod in humilitate venerit & paupertate. And Epist. 140. Absque passionibus crucis
 universis pulchrior est virgo de virgine, qui non ex voluntate Dei, sed ex Deo natus
 est. Nisi enim habuisset & in vultu quiddam oculisque sidereum, nunquam eum
 statim secuti fuissent Apostoli, nec qui ad comprehendendum eum venerant corru-
 isſent. So S. Chrys. interprets the words of Isaiah of his divinity, or humility, or
 his passions; but those of the Psalmist, of his native corporall beauty. Οὐδὲ γὰρ θαυ-
 ματουργῶν ἦν θαυμάσιος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φαινόμενος ἀπλῶς πολλῆς ἔγχετο χάριτος·
 καὶ οὗτο ὁ προφήτης δηλῶν ἔλεγεν, ὡρεῖος κάλλει παρὰ τὰς ὑβὲς οὐρανοῦ ἀνδρά-
 των.

ledge it fulfill'd in him to the highest degree imaginable, that he was a man of sorrowes and acquainted with grief. *If. 53. 3.* But if we compare the particular predictions with the historicall passages of his sufferings, if we joyn the Prophets and Evangelists together, it will most manifestly appear the *Messias* was to suffer nothing which *Christ* hath not suffered. If *Zachary* say, *they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver*; *S. Matthew* will shew that *Judas* sold *Jesus* at the same rate, for the chief Priests covenant-*Mat. 26. 15.* ed with him for thirty pieces of silver. If *Isaiah* say that he *was wounded*, if *Zachary*, *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, if the Prophet *David* yet more particularly, *they pierced my hands and my feet*; the Evangelist *Psal. 22. 16.* will shew how he was fastened to the crosse, and *Jesus* himself the print of the nailes. If the Psalmist tell us, *they should laugh him to scorn, and shake their head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him, let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him*; *S. Matthew* will describe the same action, and the same expression; For *they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him, for he said, I am the Son of God*. Let *David* say, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* and the son of *David* will shew in whose person the Father spake it, *Eli Eli lamasabachthani*. Let *Isaiah* foretell, *he was numbred with the transgressours*; *If. 53. 12.* and you shall find him crucified between two thieves, one on his right hand, the other on his left. Read in the Psalmist, *In my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink*; and you shall find in the Evangelist, *Jesus, that the Scripture might be fulfill'd, said, I thirst: and they took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave it him to drink*. Read further yet, *They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture*; and to fulfill the prediction, the souldiers shall make good the distinction, *who took his garments, and made four parts, to every* *Joh. 19. 23, 24.*

Is. 53. 7, 8.

every souldier a part, and also his coat: now the coat was without seam woven from the top throughout; they said therefore among themselves, Let not us rent it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be. Lastly, let the Prophets teach us, that he shall be brought like a lamb to the slaughter, and be cut off out of the land of the living; all the Evangelists will declare how like a lambe he suffered, and the very Jewes will acknowledge that he was cut off. And now may we well conclude, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer*; and what it so behoved him to suffer, that he suffered.

Is. 53. 9.

Neither onely in his passion, but after his death all things were fulfill'd in *Jesus* which were prophesied concerning the *Messias*. He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, saith the Prophet of the *Christ* to come: and as the thieves were buried with whom he was crucified, so was *Jesus*, but laid in the tombe of *Joseph of Arimathea* an honourable counsellour. *After two dayes will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up*, saith *Hoseah* of the people of *Israel* in whose language they were the * type of *Christ*, and the third day *Jesus* rose from the dead. *The Lord said unto my Lord*, saith *David*, sit thou at my right hand. Now *David* is not ascended into the heavens, and consequently cannot be set at the right hand of God; but *Jesus* is already ascended, and set down at the right hand of God; and so all the house of *Israel* might know assuredly that God hath made that same *Jesus*, whom they crucified, both Lord and *Christ*. For, he who taught whatsoever the *Messias* promised by God, foretold by the prophets, expected by the people of God, was to teach; he who did all which that *Messias* was by vertue of that office to do; he which suffered all those paines and indignities which that *Messias* was to suffer; he to whom all things happened after his death, the period of his sufferings which were according to the divine predictions to come to passe; he, I say, must

Hos. 6. 2.

* Hos. 11. 1.

Ps. 110. 1.

Act. 2. 34.

Act. 2. 36.

infallibly be the true *Messias*. But *Jesus* alone taught, did, suffer'd and obtain'd all these things, as we have shewed. Therefore we may again infallibly conclude that our *Jesus* is the *Christ*.

Fourthly, If it were the proper note and character of the *Messias*, that all nations should come in to serve him; if the doctrine of *Jesus* hath been preached and received in all parts of the world, according to that character so long before deliver'd; if it were absolutely impossible that the doctrine reveal'd by *Jesus* should have been so propagated as it hath been, had it not been divine; then must this *Jesus* be the *Messias*, and when we have prov'd these three particulars, we may safely conclude he is the *Christ*.

That all nations were to come in to the *Messias*, and so the distinction between the Jew and Gentile to cease at his coming, is the most universall description in all the prophecies. God speaks to him thus, as to his Son; *Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* It was one greater then *Solomon*, of whom these words were spoken, *All kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him. It shall come to passe in the last dayes,* saith *Isaiah*, *that the mountain of the Lords house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it.* and again, *In that day there shall be a root of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek.* And in generall, all the Prophets were but instruments to deliver the same message, which *Malachy* concludes, from God. *From the rising of the Sun even to the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen,* saith the Lord of hosts. Now being the bounds of *Judea* were settled, being the promise of God was to bring all nations in at the coming

Ps. 2. 8.

Ps. 72. 11.

Is. 2. 2.

Mal. 1. 11.

ming of the *Messias*, being this was it which the Jews so much oppos'd, as loath to part from their ancient & peculiar privilege; he which actually wrought this work, must certainly be the *Messias*: & that *Jesus* did it, is most evident.

That all nations did thus come in to the doctrine preached by *Jesus*, cannot be denied. For although he *were not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, although of those many *Israelites* which believed on him while he lived, very few were left immediately after his death: yet when the Apostles had received their commission from him to go teach all nations, and were endued with power from on high, by the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost; the first day there was an accession of three thousand souls; immediately after we find the number of the men, beside women, was about five thousand; and still believers more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. Upon the persecution at *Jerusalem*, they went through the regions of *Judea*, *Galilee* and *Samaria*, and so the Gospel spread; inasmuch that *S. James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem* spake thus unto *S. Paul*, *Thou seest, brother, how many thousands* (or rather, how many myriads, that is ten thousands,) *of the Jews there are which believe*. Beside, how great was the number of the believing Jews strangers, scattered through *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia*, *Bithynia*, and the rest of the *Roman* Provinces, will appear out of the Epistles of *S. Peter*, *S. James*, and *S. John*. And yet all these are nothing to the fulness of the Gentiles which came after. First, those which were before Gentile-worshippers, acknowledging the same God with the Jews, but not receiving the Law; who had before abandoned their old Idolatry, and already embraced the true doctrine of one God, and did confesse the Deity which the Jews did worship to be that onely true God; but yet refused to be circumcised, and so to oblige themselves to the keeping of the whole law. Now the Apostles preach

Mat. 15. 24.

Mat. 28. 19.

Luc. 24. 49.

Act. 2. 41.

Act. 4. 4.

Act. 5. 14.

Act. 9. 31.

Act. 21. 20.
πῶσαι μυριά-
δες.

preaching the same God with *Moses*, whom they all acknowledged, and teaching that circumcision and the rest of the legall ceremonies were now abrogated, which those men would never admit, they were with the greatest facility converted to the Christian faith. For being present at the Synagogues of the Jewes, and understanding much of the Law, they were of all the Gentiles readiest to hear, and most capable of the Arguments which the Apostles produced out of the Scriptures to prove that *Jesus* was the *Christ*. Thus many of the *Greeks* which came up to worship at *Jerusalem*, devout men out of every nation under heaven, not men of *Israel*, but yet fearing God, did first embrace the Christian faith. After them the rest of the Gentiles left the idolatrous worship of their heathen Gods, and in a short time in infinite multitudes receiv'd the Gospel. How much did *Jesus* work by one *S. Paul* to the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed? how did he passe from *Jerusalem* round about through *Phœnice*, *Syria*, and *Arabia*, through *Asia*, *Achaia*, and *Macedonia*, even to *Illyricum*, fully preaching the Gospel of *Christ*? How farre did others passe beside *S. Paul*, that he should speak even of his time, that the Gospel was preached to every creature under heaven? Many were the Nations, innumerable the people which received the faith in the Apostles dayes; and in not many yeares after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their * numbers equallize half the *Roman Empire*; And little above two ages after the death of the last Apostle, the Emperours of the world gave in their names to *Christ*, and submitted their sceptres

Joh. 10. 20.
Act. 2. 5.

Ro. 15. 18, 19.

Colos. 1. 23.

* Tanta hominum multitudo, pars pene major civitatis cujusque, in silentio &

modestia agimus. *Tersul. ad Scapul. c. 3.* Si hostes exertos, non tantum vindices oculos agere vellemus, deesset nobis vis numerorum & copiarum? Plures nimirum *Mauri* & *Marcomanni*, ipsique *Parthi*, vel quantæcunque unius tamen loci & suorum finium gentes, quam totius orbis? Hesterni sumus, & vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. *Id. Apolog. cap. 36.* Potuimus & inermes, nec

nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes, solus divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim tanta vis hominum in aliquem orbis remoti finem abruptissemus vobis, (ussidisset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque amissio civium, imo etiam & ipsa destituitio punisset; proculdubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum, & stuporem quendam quasi mortuæ urbis, quæissetis quibus in ea imperassetis. *Id. Ibid.* And Irenæus, who wrote before Tertullian, and is mention'd by him, speaks of the Christians in his time living in the Court of Rome: Quid autem & hi qui in regali aula sunt fideles, nonne ex eis quæ Cæsaris sunt habent utensilia, & his qui non habent unusquisque secundum suam virtutem præstat?

Is. 49.23. to his laws, that *Kings* might become the *nursing fathers*, and *Queens* the *nursing mothers* of the Church.

From hence it came to passe, that according to all the predictions of the Prophets, the one God of *Israel*, the Maker of heaven and earth, was acknowledged through the world for the onely true God: That the law given to *Israel* was taken for the true law of God, but as given to that people, and so to cease, when they ceased to be a people; except the morall part thereof, which as an universall rule common to all people, is still acknowledged for the law of God, given unto all, and obliging every man: That all the Oracles of the Heathen Gods, in all places where Christianity was receiv'd, did presently cease, and all the Idols, or the Gods themselves were rejected and condemned as spurious. For the Lord of Hosts had spoken concerning those times expressly; *It shall*

Zach. 13.2.

come to passe in that day, that I will cut off the names of the Idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembred, also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to passe out of the land.

Now being this generall reception of the Gospel was so anciently, so frequently foretold, being the same was so clearly and universallly perform'd, even this might seem sufficient to perswade that *Jesus is Christ*. But lest any should not yet be fully satisfied, we shall further shew, that it is impossible *Jesus* should have been so received for the true *Messias*, had he not been so; or that his doctrine

ctrine which teacheth him to be the *Christ*, should be admitted by all nations for divine, had it not been such. For whether we look upon the Nature of the Doctrine taught, the Condition of the Teachers of it, or the Manner in which it was taught, it can no way seem probable that it should have had any such success, without the immediate working of the hand of God, acknowledging *Jesus* for his Son, the doctrine for his own, and the fulfilling by the hands of the Apostles what he had foretold by the Prophets.

As for the Nature of the Doctrine, it was no way likely to have any such success: for first, it absolutely condemned all other Religions, settled and corroborated by a constant succession of many ages, under which many nations and kingdoms, and especially at that time the *Romans*, had signally flourished. Secondly, it contained Precepts farre more ungratefull and troublesome to flesh and blood, and contrariant to the generall inclination of mankind; as the abnegation of our selves, the mortifying of the flesh, the love of our enemies, and the bearing of the crosse. Thirdly, it inforced those precepts seemingly unreasonable, by such promises as were as seemingly incredible, and unperceivable. For they were not of the good things of this world, or such as afford any complacency to our sense; but of such as cannot be obtained till after this life, and necessarily presuppose that, which then seem'd as absolutely impossible, the Resurrection. Fourthly, it delivered certain predictions which were to be fulfill'd in the persons of such as should embrace it, which seem sufficient to have kept most part of the world from listning to it, as dangers, losses, afflictions, tribulations, and in summe, *All that would live godly in Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. 3. 12. should suffer persecution.*

If we look upon the Teachers of this Doctrine, there appeared nothing in them which could promise any such success. The first Revealer and Promulger bred in the house of a Carpenter, brought up at the feet of no Professor,

1 Cor. 1. 23.

seffour, despised by the High priests, the Scribes, and Pharisees, and all the learned in the religion of his nation; in the time of his preaching apprehended, bound, buffeted, spit upon, condemned, crucified; betrayed in his life by one disciple, denied by another; at his death distrusted by all. What advantage can we perceive toward the propagation of the Gospel, in this authour of it, *Christ crucified, unto the Jewes a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishnesse*? What in those which followed him, sent by him, and thence call'd Apostles, men by birth obscure, by education illiterate, by profession low and inglorious? How can we conceive that all the Schools and Universities of the world should give way to them, and the kingdomes and empires should at last come in to them, except their doctrine were indeed divine, except that *Jesus* whom they testified to be the *Christ*, were truly so?

1 Cor. 2. 4.

If we consider the manner in which they delivered this Doctrine to the world, it will adde no advantage to their persons, or advance the probability of successe. For in their delivery they used no such rhetoricall expressions, or ornaments of eloquence, to allure or entice the world; they affected no such subtilty of wit, or strength of argumentation, as thereby to perswade and convince men; they made use of no force or violence to compell, no corporall menaces to affright mankind unto a compliance. But in a plain simplicity of words, they nakedly delivered what they had seen and heard, *preaching us with enticing words of mans wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit*. It is not then rationally imaginable, that so many Nations should forsake their own religions, so many ages professed, and brand them all as damnable, onely that they might embrace such precepts as were most unacceptable to their naturall inclinations, and that upon such promises as seem'd not probable to their reason, nor could have any influence on their sense, and

and notwithstanding those predictions, which did assure them upon the receiving of that doctrine to be exposed to all kind of misery : That they should do this upon the Authority of him, who for the same was condemned and crucified, and by the perswasion of them who were both illiterate and obscure : That they should be enticed with words without eloquence, convinced without the least subtilty, constrained without any force. I say, it is no way imaginable, how this should come to passe, had not the Doctrine of the Gospel which did thus prevail, been certainly divine ; had not the light of the word, which thus dispell'd the clouds of all former Religions, come from heaven ; had not that *Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith*, been the true *Messias*.

To conclude this discourse. He who was in the world at the time when the *Messias* was to come, and no other at that time or since pretended ; He who was born of the same family, in the same place, after the same manner, which the Prophets foretold of the birth of the *Messias* ; He which taught all those truths, wrought all those miracles, suffer'd all those indignities, received all that glory, which the *Messias* was to teach, do, suffer, and receive ; He whose doctrine was received in all nations, according to the character of the *Messias* ; He was certainly the true *Messias*. But we have already sufficiently shew'd that all these things are exactly fulfill'd in *Jesus*, and in him alone. We must therefore acknowledge and professe that this *Jesus* is the promised *Messias*, that is, the *Christ*.

Having thus manifested the truth of this proposition, * In *Christi* *Jesus* is the *Christ*, and shewed the interpretation of the word *Christ* to be Anointed ; we find it yet * necessary for the explication of this Article, to enquire what was the end, or immediate effect of his *Unction*, and how or in what manner he was anointed to that end.

For the first, as the *Messias* was foretold, so was

In *Christi*
nomine subau-
ditur qui unxit,
& ipse qui un-
ctus est, & ipsa
unctio in qua
unctus est.

Iren. l. 3. c. 20.
he

* οἱ βασιλεῖς
πάντες καὶ οἱ
χριστοὶ ἀπὸ
τῆς μετε-
γενεῆς καὶ βασι-
λεῖς καλεῖται
καὶ χριστοί.
Jult. Marr.
Dial.

† Christus à
chrismate dici-
tur: quia sicut
antiqui reges à
sacerdotibus
oleo sacro pro-
fundebantur,
sic Christus
Sp. S. infusio-
ne repletus
est. Author
Serm. 131.
de Temp.
a 1 Sam. 15. 1.
b 1 Kin. 19.

15, 16. ¶ Sicut nunc Romanis indumentum purpuræ in signe est regis dignitatis
assumptæ: sic illis unctio sacri unguenti nomen ac potestatem regiam conferbat.
Laet. l. 4. c. 7. * For though at the first the sons of Aaron were anointed as well
as Aaron, as appears Ex. 40. 15. Thou shalt anoint them as thou didst anoint
their father, that they may administer to me in the Priests office: Yet they were
not after anointed, but the successors of Aaron onely. For, saith the Text, their
anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations.
and therefore after this first anointing they shall need no more, onely the successors
in the High-priesthood shall reiterate the unctio: from whence the Priest that is a-
nointed after ward signified the High Priest, as Lev. 4. 3. יִשְׁמֹעֵאל LXX
ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ καὶ χρισμὴν, by way of explication; whereas verse the 5. and the
26. of the same chapter, and 6. 22. they render it by a bare translation, ὁ ἁγιάζων
ὁ χριστός. † As Laet. Erat Judæis ante præceptum ut sacrum conficerent unguen-
tum, quo perungi possent ii qui vocabantur ad sacerdotium vel ad regnum. l. 4. c. 7.
S. August. Prioribus Veteris Testamenti temporibus ad duas solas personas perti-
nuit unctio. Enar. 2. Psal. 21. Christus vel Pontificale vel Regium nomen est. Nam
prius & Pontifices unguento chrismatis consecrabantur & Reges. Ruff. in Symb.

shall

shalt thou anoint to be King over Israel, and Elisha the son of Shaphat shalt thou anoint to be Prophet in thy room.

Therefore hence it * hath been concluded that the three Offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, belonged to *Jesus* as the *Christ*, and that upon good reason. For the commonwealth of *Israel* was totally order'd and dispos'd, both in the Constitution and Administration of it, for, and with respect unto, the *Messias*. The Constitution of that people was made by a sejunction and separation of them from all other nations on the earth: and this began in *Abraham*, with a peculiar promise of a seed, in whom all the nations should be blessed, and be united into one Religion. That promised seed was the *Messias*, the type of whom was *Isaac*. This separation was continued by the Administration of that Commonwealth, which was a *royall priesthood*: and that Administration of the people did consist in three functions, propheticall, regall, sacerdotall; all which had respect unto the *Messias*, as the scope of all the prophets, and the complement of their prophecies, as the Lord of the temple, and the end of all the sacrifices for which the temple was erected, as the heir of an eternall priesthood *after the order of Melchizedek*, and of the throne of *David*, or an everlasting kingdom. Being then the separation was to cease at the coming of the *Messias*, being that could not cease so long as the Administration of that people stood, being that administration did consist in those three functions; it followeth that those three were to be united in the person of the *Messias*, who was to make all one, and consequently that the *Christ* was to be Prophet, Priest, and King. Again, the Redemption or Salvation which the *Messias* was to bring, consisteth in the freeing of a sinner

* τὸ τοῦ
χρίσματος μὴ
μόνον Ἀρχιε-
ρεῦσι παρα-
δοθῆναι, ἀλλ-
ὰ καὶ τοῖς
κατὰ ταῦτα
Προφήταις καὶ
Βασιλεῦσιν,
οἷς καὶ αὐτοῖς
τέτρω χρίσας
μόνοις ἐξέν
ἦν τὸ μυσ-
τήριον.
Euf. Demonst.
Evan. l. 4. 15.
& Hist. l. 1.
c. 4. Where-
fore S. Aug.
recollecting a
place in his
83 Questions,
in which he
had taught, the
two fishes in
the Gospel,
duas illas per-
sonas signifi-
care quibus po-
pulus ille rege-
batur, ut per
eas consilio-
rum modera-
men acciperet,
regiam scilicet
& sacerdotale-
m, ad quas
etiam sacro-

sancta illa unctio pertinebat, makes this particular Retraction; Dicendum po-
tius fuit, maxime pertinebat, quoniam unctos aliquando legimus & Prophetas.
Retract. l. 1. c. 26.

from the state of sin and eternall death into a state of righteousness and eternall life. Now a freedome from sin in respect of the guilt, could not be wrought without a sacrifice propitiatory, and therefore there was a necessity of a Priest; a freedome from sin in respect of the dominion, could not be obtained without a revelation of the will of God, and of his wrath against all ungodlinesse, therefore there was also need of a Prophet; a translation from the state of death into eternall life, is not to be effected without absolute authority and irresistible power, therefore a King was also necessary. The *Messias* then, the Redeemer of *Israel*, was certainly anointed for that end, that he might become Prophet, Priest, and King. And if we believe him, whom we call *Jesus*, that is, our Saviour and Redeemer, to be *Christ*, we must assest him by his Unction sent to perform all these three Offices.

That *Jesus* was anointed to the Propheticall Office, though we need no more to prove it then the prediction of *Isaiah*, *The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor*; the explication of our Saviour, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your eares*; and the confession of the Synagogue at Nazareth, who all bare him witnesse, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth: yet whether we consider his Preparation, his Mission, or his Administration, all of them speak him fully to have performed it. For to *Jeremiah* indeed God said, *Before thou camest forth out of the wombe, I sanctified thee, I ordained thee a Prophet unto the Nations*; & of *John* the Baptist, *He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mothers wombe*. And if these became singular Prophets by their preparative sanctification, how much more eminent must his propheticall preparation be, to whose mother it is said, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*? If the Levites must be
thirty

Is. 61. 1.

Luk. 4. 21, 22.

Jer. 1. 5.

Luk. 1. 15.

Luk. 1. 35.

thirty years old, every one that came to do the service of the ministry; Jesus will not enter upon the publick administration of this office, till he begin to be about thirty yeares of age. Then doth the Holy Ghost descend in a bodily shape like a Dove upon him: then must a voice come from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased. Never such preparations, never such an Inauguration of a Prophet.

As for his Mission, never any was confirmed with such letters of credence, such irrefragable testimonials, as the formall testimony of John the Baptist, and the more virtuall testimony of his Miracles. Behold, I will send you Elias the Prophet before the coming of the great and dreadfull day of the Lord, saith God by Malachy. and John went before him in the spirit of Elias, saith another Malachy, even an Angel from heaven. This John, or Elias, saw the Spirit descend on Jesus, and bare record that this is the Son of God. The Jewes took notice of this testimony, who said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him; and Jesus himself puts them in mind of it. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth; nay they themselves confessed his testimony to be undeniable, John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man, were true. But though the witness of John were thus cogent, yet the testimony of Miracles was farre more irrefragable. I have greater witness then that of John, saith our Saviour; for the works which my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. Norwithstanding the precedent record of John, Jesus requireth not an absolute assent without his Miracles: If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But upon them he challengeth belief: But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me.

me, and I in him. If then *Moses*, and other Prophets, to whom God gave the power of Miracles, did assert their mission to be from God by the divine works which they wrought; much more efficacious to this purpose must the Miracles of *Jesus* appear, who wrought more wonders then they all.

Now the Prophetick function consisteth in the promulgation, confirmation, and perpetuation of the Doctrine containing the will of God for the salvation of man. And the perfect Administration of this Office must be attributed unto *Jesus*. For no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him. He gave unto the Apostles the words which his Father gave him: therefore he hath revealed the perfect will of God. The confirmation of this doctrine cannot be denied him, who lived a most innocent and holy life to perswade it, for he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who wrought most powerfull and divine works to confirm it, and was thereby known to be a teacher from God; who died a most painfull and shamefull death to ratifie it, witnessing a good profession before *Pontius Pilate*; which in it self unto that purpose efficacious, was made more evidently operative in the raising of himself from death. The propagation and perpetuall succession of this Doctrine must likewise be attributed unto *Jesus*, as to no temporary or accidentall Prophet, but as to him who instituted and instructed all who have any relation to that function. For the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets. and when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men. For he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.

Now as *Jesus* was anointed with the Unction of *Elizew* to the Prophetickall, so was he also with the Unction of

of *Aaron* to the Sacerdotall Office. Not that he was called after the order of *Aaron*, For it is evident that *Heb. 7. 14.* our Lord sprang out of *Judah*, of which tribe *Moses* spake nothing concerning priesthood; but after a more ancient order, according to the prediction of the Psalmist, *The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.* But though he were of another order, yet whatsoever *Aaron* did as a Priest was wholly Typicall, and consequently to be fulfilled by the *Messias*, as he was a Priest. For the Priesthood did not begin in *Aaron*, but was translated and conferr'd upon his family, before his consecration. We read of the Priests which came near the Lord; of young men *Ex. 19. 22.* of the children of *Israel*, which offered burnt-offerings *Ex. 24. 5.* and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord; which without question were no other then the first-born to whom the Priesthood did belong. *Jesus* therefore as the first-begotten of God, was by right a Priest, and being anointed unto that Office, performed every function, by way of Oblation, Intercession, and Benediction. * Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man *Jesus*, if he be an High priest, have somewhat also to offer. Not that he had any thing beside himself, or that there was any peculiar sacrifice allowed to this Priest; to whom when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me; and by the offering of this body of *Jesus Christ* are we sanctified. For he who is our Priest hath † given himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.

* For the Hebrew נערי signifying juvenes, by the Targum is rendered בוכרי that is, primogeniti. *Heb. 8. 3.*

Heb. 10. 5.

Heb. 10. 10.

Eph. 5. 2.

† Unus ipse erat qui offerebat, & quod

offerebat. *S. Aug.* Unum cum illo manebat cui offerebat, unum in se fecit pro quibus offerebat, unus ipse erat qui offerebat, & quod offerebat. *Id. de Trinit.*

Now when *Jesus* had thus given himself a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, he ascended up on high, and entred

Rom. 8. 34.

Heb. 7. 25.

* Παράκλητον
 ἔχομεν Ἰη-
 σὺν, ὃς ὡς
 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
 προκαλινδύ-
 μανον τῷ πα-
 τρι καὶ προσ-
 πίπτουσιν αὐ-
 τῷ ὡς ἀπαρχὴ
 τῶν ἀελίων ὄν-
 τας ὑπόνοιαν
 καὶ ἀναξίαν τῷ
 πνεύματι
 ἕτερον τῷ πα-
 τρι τὸ ὅτι
 ζητεῖν ἕτε-
 ρόν ἢ τὸν πα-
 τῆρα ὡς περὶ θεοῦ
 διανοεῖται
 δίκαιον. ἀλλ'
 οἱ πίπτοντες
 ὡς ἄνθρωποι,
 περὶ κατὰ
 ῥῆν ὡς λόγος,
 καὶ παραινέ-
 τος τὸ τοιοῦ-
 τόν μοι ἡ
 παράκλησις.
 S. Greg. Naz.
 Orat. 36.
 a 1 Chr. 23. 13.
 b Gen. 14.
 19, 20.
 c Luk. 1. 8,
 21, 22.

into the Holy of holies not made with hands, and there appeared before God as an atonement for our sin. Nor is he prevalent onely in his own oblation once offer'd, but in his constant intercession. *Who is he that condemneth?* saith the Apostle, *it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* Upon this foundation he buildeth our perswasion, that *he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him; seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.* Nor must we look upon this as a * servile or precarious, but rather as an efficacious and glorious intercession, as of him, to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth. Beside these offerings and intercedings, there was something more required of the Priest, and that is blessing. *a Aaron was separated that he should sanctifie the most holy things, he and his sons for ever, to burn incense before the Lord, and to blesse in his name for ever.* We read of no other sacerdotall Act perform'd by Melchizedek the Priest of the most High God, but onely that of blessing, and that in respect both of God and man: First, *b he blessed man, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most High God, possessour of heaven and earth; then, Blessed be the most High God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand.* Now it is observable what the Rabbins have delivered, that at the morning sacrifice, the Priests under the law did blesse the people with the solemn form of Benediction, but at the evening sacrifice they blessed them not; to shew that in the evening of the world, the last dayes, which are the dayes of the *Messiah*, the benediction of the Law should cease, and the blessing of the *Christ* take place. When *Zachariah* the Priest the father of *John Baptist* the forerunner of our Saviour, executed his office before God, *in the order of his course,* and the whole multitude of the people waited for him, to receive his benediction, he could not speak unto them, for

he

he was dumbe; shewing the power of benediction was now passing to another and farre greater Priest, even to *Jesus*, whose doctrine in the mount begins with *Blessed*; who when he left his disciples, *lift up his hands and blessed them.* And yet this function is principally performed after his resurrection, as it is written, *Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to blesse you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities.* It cannot then be denied that *Jesus*, who offered up himself a most perfect sacrifice and oblation for sin, who still maketh continuall intercession for us, who was raised from the dead that he might blesse us with an everlasting benediction, is a most true and most perfect Priest.

Luk. 24. 50.

The third Office belonging to the *Messias* was the Regall, as appeareth by the most ancient * tradition of the *Jewes*, and by the expresse predictions of the Prophets. * For the Chaldee Paraphrase in the most places where it mentioneth the *Messiah*, doth it with the addition of King, מלך משיח. a Ps 2. 6. b If. 9. 6. c Of the encrease of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdome, to order it, and to establish it with judgement and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. All g 7.

which most certainly belongs unto our *Jesus*, by the unerring interpretation of the Angel *Gabriel*, who promised the blessed Virgin that the *Lord God* should give unto her Son the throne of his father *David*, and he shall reign over the house of *Jacob* for ever, and of his kingdome there shall be no end. He acknowledgeth himself this Office, though by a strange and unlikely representation of it, the riding on an asse: but by that it was fulfill'd which was spoken by the Prophet; *Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee meek, and sitting on an asse.* He made as strange a confession of it unto *Pilate*;

Luk. 1. 32, 33.

Mat. 21. 5.

Joh. 18. 37.

Eph. 1. 20, 21.

Revel. 19.
13, 16.

Rev. 1. 6.

Mat. 16. 28.

late ; for when he said unto him, *Art thou a king then ?* Jesus answered, *thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witnesse unto the truth.* The inauguration into this Office was at his ascension into heaven, and his session at the right hand of God ; not but that he was by right a King before, but the full and publick execution was deferred till then, *when God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, farre above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion.* Then he whose name is called the word of God, *had on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords.* This Regall office of our Saviour consisteth partly in the ruling, protecting, and rewarding of his people ; partly in the coercing, condemning, and destroying of his enemies. First, he ruleth in his own people, by delivering them a law, by which they walk ; by furnishing them with his grace, by which they are enabled to walk in it. Secondly, he protecteth the same, by helping them to subdue their lusts, which reign in their mortall bodies ; by preserving them from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil ; by supporting them in all their afflictions ; by delivering them from all their enemies. Thirdly, whom he thus ruleth and protecteth here, he rewardeth hereafter in a most royall manner, making *them Kings and Priests unto God and his father.* On the contrary, he sheweth his Regall Dominion in the destruction of his enemies, whether they were temporall or spirituall enemies. Temporall, as the *Jewes and Romans*, who joyned together in his crucifixion. While he was on earth he told his Disciples, *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdome.* and in that kingdome he was then seen to come, when he brought utter destruction on the *Jewes* by the *Roman* armies, not long after to be destroyed themselves.

selves. But beside these visible enemies, there are other spirituall, those which hinder the bringing in of his own people into his fathers Kingdome, those which refuse to be subject unto him, and consequently deny him to be their King; as all wicked and ungodly men, of whom he hath said, *These mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.* Thus Sin, Satan, and Death, being the enemies to his Kingdome, shall all be destroyed in their order. *For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.* Thus is our Jesus become the Prince of the Kings of the earth; thus is the Lambe acknowledged to be Lord of lords, and King of kings. Luk. 19. 27.
1 Cor. 15.
25, 26.
Rev. 1. 5.
17. 14.

Wherefore seeing we have already shewed that the Propheticall, Sacerdotall, and Regall Offices were to belong unto the promised *Messias*, as the proper end, and immediate effect of his Unction; seeing we have likewise declared how *Jesus* was anointed to these Offices, and hath, and doth actually perform the same in all the functions belonging to them: there remaineth nothing for the full explication of this particular concerning the *Christ*, but onely to shew the manner of this Unction, which is very necessary to be explained. For how they were anointed under the Law who were the types of the *Messias*, is plain and evident, because the manner was prescribed, and the materials were visible: God appointed an oyl to be made, and appropriated it to that use: and the pouring that oyl upon the body of any person, was his anointing to that office for which he was designed. But being that oyl so appropriated to this use was lost many hundred yeares before our Saviours birth, being the custome of anointing in this manner had a long time ceased, being howsoever we never read that *Jesus* was at all anointed with oyl; it remaineth still worthy our enquiry, how he was anointed, so as to answer to the former unctions; and

what it was which answered to that oyl, which then was lost, and was at the first but as a type of this which now we search for.

The † *Jewes* tell us, that the anointing oyl was hid in the dayes of *Josiah*, and that it shall be found and produced again when the *Messias* comes, that he may be anointed with it, and the Kings and High Priests of his dayes. But though the losse of that oyl bespake the destruction of that Nation, yet the *Christ* which was to come needed no such unction for his consecration; there being as great a difference between the Typicall and Correspondent Oyl, as between the representing and represented *Christ*. The Prophet *David* calleth it not by the vulgar name of oyl of unction, but the a oyl of gladnesse. For though that place may in the first sense be understood of *Solomon*, whom when *Zadoc* the Priest anointed, b they blew the Trumpet, and all the people said, God save king *Solomon*. And all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoyced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them; though from thence it might be said of him, thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladnesse above thy fellowes: yet being those words are spoken unto God, as well as of God, (* therefore God, thy God,) the oyl with which that God is

In the dayes of the *Messias* God will restore unto his people the oyl of unction which *Moses* made, which was bidden with the ark; and the Kings and High priests shall be anointed with it in those dayes. *Abarbanel. Comment. ad 30. Exodi.* Now the losse of that oyl, which they call the hiding of it, may well be thought to foretell the period of the *Mosaicall Administration*, being they confesse that after that they never had any Priests anointed, because they had no power to make the same oyl. So plainly confesseth the same *Abarbanel.*

אֵלֹהִים הָיָה כִּהֵן מְשֻׁחַ בְּבֵית יְהוָה לְפִי שֶׁכֶּבֶד הָיָה נִגְנוּ שְׁמֵן הַמְּשָׁחָה שֶׁנִּגְנוּ יְאֻשִׁיוֹ עִם שֶׁאֵר הַדְּבָרִים וְהַיְשׁוּם וְלֹא הָיָה לָהֶם דְּשׁוֹת לַעֲשׂוֹתוֹ. a *Psal. 45. 5.* b *1. Kin. 1. 39. 40.*

* *Duas personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei, & qui unxit, intellige. Unde & Aquila* *elohim אֱלֹהִים* verbum Hebraicum non nominativo casu, sed vocativo interpretatur, dicens *Θεέ*, & nos propter intelligentiam Deo posuimus, quod Latina lingua non accipit, ne quis perverse putet Deum dilecti & amantissimi & regis sui Patrem nominari. *S. Hieron. Epist. 104.* Quod sequitur, *Unxit te Deus Deus tuus*, primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativus

anoint-

quod satis miror, cur *Aquila* non, ut cœperat in primo versiculo, vocativo casu interpretatus sit, sed nominativo, his nominans Deum qui supradictum unxit Deum. *Id. ib.*

anointed, must in the ultimate and highest sense signifie a farre greater gladnesse then that at *Solomons* coronation was, even the fountain of all joy and felicity in the Church of God.

The * Ancients tell us that this oyl is the Divinity it self, and in the language of the Scriptures it is the Holy Ghost. S. *Peter* teacheth us how God anointed *Jesus* of *Nazareth* with the Holy Ghost and with power. Now though there can be no question but the Spirit is the oyl, yet there is some doubt, when *Jesus* was anointed with it. For we know the Angel said unto the blessed Virgin, * *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* From whence it appeareth that from the Conception, or at the Incarnation, *Jesus* was sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Highest; and so consequently, as S. *Peter* spake, he was anointed then with the Holy Ghost and with power. Again, being we read that after he was thirty yeares of age, the Spirit like a Dove descended and lighted upon him, and he descen-

* So Gregory Naz. expounds the place. ὁ ἅγιος ἐλάσας αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέχευε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου ἐσκέπη αὐτόν. And again, Χριστὸς δὲ διὰ τὴν θεοποίησιν (not that his Divinity was anointed, or Christ anointed in respect of his Divinity,

but that he was anointed in his humanity by his Divinity.) χρίσας γὰρ αὐτὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἐκ οὐρανοῦ, κατὰ τὴν ἄλλαν χρίσιν, ἀγαθὰ ἔχοντα, παρυσία δὲ ὅλων τῶν χρίσεων, ἡς ἔργον ἀνθρώπου ἀκούσας τὸ χρίον, καὶ ποιῆσαι θεὸν τὸ χρίσμενον. Orat. 2. de filio. à Luk. 1. 35. † Χριστὸς ἐχρίθη ὡς βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεὺς τῷ χρίσματι τῆς σαρκώσεως. Germanus Constantin. Καὶ χρίσας δὲ ἐκ ὁρίωνος φάμεν τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι κατὰ σάρκα γενόμενον, δηλοῦντι καθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀνθρώπων. *Titus Bostrenf.* Deus est qui ungit, & Deus qui secundum carnem ungitur Dei filius. Denique quos habet unctionis suæ Christus nisi in carne participes? Vides igitur quia Deus à Deo unctus, sed in assumptione naturæ unctus humanæ Dei filius designatur. S. *Ambros.* de Fide l. 1. c. 2. Hæc omnia carni conveniunt, cum piissimum & gloriosissimum verbum unitum est pro salutē cunctorum. *Cassiodorus* in *Psal.* 44.

† S. Hierome
mentioning
that place of
the Psalm,
Quando con-
fortes nomi-
nuntur, natu-
ram carnis in-
telligit, quia
Deus confort-
es substantiæ
sue non habet.
Et quia erat
unctio spiritu-
alis & nequa-
quam humani
corporis (ut
fuit in sacer-
dotibus Iuda-
eorum) ideo
præ conforti-
bus, id est
ceteris sanctis,
unctus esse
memoratur.
Cujus unctio
illo expleta est
tempore, quan-
do baptizatus
est in Jorda-
ne, & Spiritus
Sanctus in
specie colum-
bæ descendit
super eum, & mansit in illo. Comment. in Esaiam, c. 61. In
illa columba quæ super ipsum post baptismum descendit, cum sacramento baptis-
matis, & veri sacerdotii jura suscepit, fuso videlicet super eum oleo exultationis,
de quo Psalmista canit; Unxit te, inquit, Deus, Deus tuus. Petrus Damianus,
Opuscul. 6, c. 4. a 1 Sam. 16, 13. b Psal. 89, 20. c 2 Sam. 2, 4, 5, 1, 3.

ding in the power of the Spirit into *Galilee*, said unto them of *Nazareth*, *This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*, meaning that of *Isaiah*, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel*; hence † hath it been also collected, that his Unction was performed at his Baptisme. Nor need we to contend which of these two was the true time of our Saviours Unction, since neither is destructive of the other, and consequently both may well consist together. *David*, the most undoubted type of the *Messiah*, was anointed at *Bethlehem*, for there ^a *Samuel took the horn of oyl, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren, and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward*. Of which unction those words of God must necessarily be understood, ^b *I have found David my servant, with my holy oyl have I anointed him*. And yet he was again anointed at *Hebron*, first, ^c *over the house of Judah*, then over all the tribes of *Israel*. As therefore *David* at his first Unction received the Spirit of God, and a full right unto the throne of *Israel*, which yet he was not to exercise till the death of *Saul*, and acceptance of the Tribes; and therefore when the time was come that he should actually enter upon his Regall Office, he was again anointed: So our *Jesus*, the Son of *David*, was first sanctified and anointed with the Holy Ghost at his conception, and thereby received a right unto, and was prepared for all those Offices which belonged to the Redeemer of the world; but when he was to enter upon the actuall performance of all those functions which belonged to him, then doth the same Spirit which had sanctified him at his conception,

visibly descend upon him at his inauguration. And that most properly upon his Baptisme, because according to the customes of those ancient nations, washing was wont to * precede their unctions: wherefore *a Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water, and lo the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove: As David sent Solomon to be anointed at Gihon: from whence arose that ancient observation of the Rabbins, that † Kings were not to be anointed but by a fountain.*

a Mat. 3. 16.

** As appears by those entertainments so frequently mentioned by Homer in his Odysses; as when Telemachus and*

Pisistratus are invited into the Court of Menelaus.

Ἔς ῥ' ἀοικίονδ' βασιλῆς εὐχέμενος λῦσσετο.

Τὸς δ' ἐπεὶ ἐν δαίμονι λῦσαν καὶ χεῖσαν ἐλάτω. Od. Δ.

Thus Ulysses is entertained, Od. Θ. thus Eurytus and Telemachus, Od. Π. and Venus returning to Paphus, is so ordered by the Charites.

Ἐνθα δὲ μιν χεῖρες λῦσαν καὶ χεῖσαν ἐλάτω

Ἀμβρότω, οἷα θεὸς ἐπνήνοθεν αἰὲν ἔδοντας. Od. Θ.

The common custome of the Jewes, as appears by the words of Naomi to Ruth, Wash thy self therefore, and anoint thee, and put thy raiment upon thee. Ruth 3. 3.

† They say in the Gemara, that this is a Maxime of the Doctors. אמרו בגמרא אבארבנל תנו רבנן אין משוחין את המלכים אלא המעון. Abarbanel in 30. Exod.

Now as we have shewed that *Jesus* was anointed with the Holy Ghost, lest any should deny any such descension to be a proper or sufficient unction, we shall further make it appear, that the Effusion, or Action of the Spirit, eminently containeth whatsoever the *Jewes* have imagined to be performed or signified by those legall anointings. Two very good reasons they render, why God did command the use of such anointing oyl, as in respect of the action. First, that it might signifie the divine election of that person, and designation to that office: from whence it was necessary that it should be performed by a Prophet, who understood the will of God. Secondly, that by it the person anointed might be made fit to receive the divine influx. For the first, it is evident there

*Abarbanel
Ibid.*

Mat. 3. 17.

Judg. 9. 9.

† Unguenta
optime servan-
tur in alaba-
stris, odores in
oleo. Plin.
Hist. l. 13. c. 2.
Existimatur &
ebori vindi-
cando à carie
utile esse. Certe
simulacrum

Saturni Romæ intus oleo repletum est. Id. l. 15. c. 7. And whosoever made the Statue at Rome, seems to have had his art out of Greece, from that famous Ivory Statue made by Phidias. Οὗτος ὁμοίαν τὴν κατασκευάσας Πρωτον Ἰδωλον (ὡς ἐλέφαντος δὲ οὗτο ἦν) ἔλαιον ἐκχρῖσθαι προσέταξεν ἀμφὶ τὰς πόδας, ἵνα μὴ φθῇ ἀπὸ ἀέρος, ἀλλὰ διαρκέσῃ εἰς πάντα χρόνον. Proclus apud Euseb. Hist. 64. §. 18.

could be no such infallible sign of the divine designation of *Jesus* to his Offices, as the visible descent of the Spirit, attended with a voice from heaven, instead of the hand of a Prophet, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* For the second, this spirituall Uction was so farre from giving lesse then an aptitude to receive the divine influx, that it was that divine influx nay the Divinity it self, the Godhead dwelling in him bodily. In respect of the matter, they give two causes why it was oyl, and not any other liquour. First, because of all other it signifies the greatest glory and excellency. The Oliye was the first of trees mentioned as fit for sovereignty, in regard of its fatnesse wherewith they honour God and man. Therefore it was fit that those persons which were called to a greater dignity then the rest of the Jewes, should be consecrated by oyl, as the best sign of election to honour. And can there be a greater honour then to be the Son of God, the *beloved Son*, as *Jesus* was proclaimed at this Uction, by which he was consecrated to such an Office as will obtain him a name farre above all names? Secondly, they tell us that oyl continueth uncorrupted longer then any other liquour. And indeed it hath been observed to preserve not onely it self, but other things from corruption. Hence they conclude it fit, their Kings and Priests, whose succession was to continue for ever, should be anointed with oyl, the most proper embleme of Eternity. But even by this reason of their own, their Uction is ceased, being the succession of their Kings and Priests is long since cut off, and their eternall and eternizing oyl lost long before. And onely that one *Jesus* who was a

nointed

ointed with the most spirituall oyl, *continueth for ever,* and therefore hath an *unchangeable Priesthood,* as being made not after the law of a carnall commandment, but after the power of an endlesse life. Beside they observe, that simple oyl without any mixture was sufficient for the Candlestick, but that which was designed for Unction must be compounded with principall spices, which signifie a good name, alwayes to be acquired by those in places of greatest dignity, by the most laudable and honourable actions. And certainly never was such an admixtion of spices, as in the Unction of our Saviour, by which he was endued with all variety of the graces of God, by which he was inabled to *offer himself a sacrifice for a sweet-smelling savour.* For as *he was full of* Heb. 7. 16, 2. *grace and truth; so of his fulnesse have we all received,* 1 Joh. 2. 27. *grace for grace: and as we have received anointing of him; so we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ.* A- 2 Cor. 2. 15. gain, it was sufficient to anoint the vessels of the Sanctuary in any part, but it was particularly commanded that the oyl should be powred upon the head of the Kings and Priests, as the seat of all the animal faculties, the fountain of all dignitie, and * originall of all the mem- * According to the Etymology in the Hebrew language, of which Abarbanel here takes notice; וְכֵן נִקְרָא ראש כי הוא ראשית לכל האברים יהוה מטולה שבהם
bers of the body. This was more eminently fulfill'd in *Jesus*, who by his Unction, or as *Christ*, became the *head of the Church*; nay the *a head of all principality and power, from which all the body by joynts and bands ha-* *ving nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth* with the encrease of God. Lastly, they observe, that though in the Vessels nothing but a single unction was required, yet in the Kings and Priests there was commanded, or at least practised, both Unction and Affusion, (as it is written, *b He poured of the anointing oyl upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to sanctifie him;*) the first to signifie their separation; the second to assure them of the *a Col. 2. 10. b Lev. 8.* falling of the Spirit upon them. Now what more clear then that our *Christ* was anointed by Affusion, whether we

we look upon his conception, *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee*; or his inauguration, *the spirit descended and lighted upon him*? And thus according unto all particulars required by the Jewes themselves to compleat their legall Unctions, we have sufficiently shewed that *Jesus* was, as most eminently, so most properly, anointed with the Spirit of God.

Wherefore being we have shewn that a *Messias* was to come into the world; being we have proved that he is already come, by the same predictions by which we believe he was to come; being we have demonstrated that *Jesus* born in the dayes of *Herod*, was, and is, that promised *Messias*; being we have further declared, that he was anointed to those Offices which belonged to the *Messias*, and actually did, and doth still perform them all; and that his anointing was by the immediate effusion of the Spirit, which answereth fully to all things required in the Legall and Typicall Unction: I cannot see what further can be expected for explication or confirmation of this truth, that *Jesus is the Christ*.

The necessity of believing this part of the Article is most apparent, because it were impossible he should be our *Jesus*, except he were the *Christ*. For he could not reveal the way of Salvation, except he were a Prophet; he could not work out that Salvation revealed, except he were a Priest; he could not conferre that Salvation upon us, except he were a King; he could not be Prophet, Priest, and King, except he were *the Christ*. This was the fundamentall doctrine which the Apostles not only testified, as they did that of the Resurrection, but argued, prov'd, and demonstrated out of the Law and the Prophets. We find *S. Paul* at *Thessalonica* three Sabbath dayes reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alledging that *Christ* must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead, and that this *Jesus* whom I preach unto you, is *Christ*. We find him again at *Co-*
rinth

Act. 17. 2, 3.

reinth pressed in spirit, and testifying to the Jewes, that Jesus was Christ. Thus Apollos by birth a Jew, but instructed in the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, mightily convinced the Jewes, and that publickly, shewing by the Scriptures, that Jesus was Christ. This was the touchstone by which all men at first were tried, whether they were Christian or Antichristian. For *whosoever believeth*, saith S. John, *that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*. What greater commendation of the assertion of this truth? *Who is a liar*, saith the same Apostle, *but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This man is the Antichrist, as denying the Father and the Son*. What higher condemnation of the negation of it?

Secondly, as it is necessary to be believed as a most fundamentall truth, so it hath as necessary an influence upon our conversations, because except it hath so, it cannot clearly be maintain'd. Nothing can be more absurd in a disputant, then to pretend to demonstrate a Truth as infallible, and at the same time to shew it impossible. And yet so doth every one who professeth faith in Christ already come, and liveth not according to that profession; for thereby he proveth as farre as he is able, that the true Christ is not yet come, at least that Jesus is not he. We sufficiently demonstrate to the Jewes that our Saviour, who did and suffer'd so much, is the true *Messias*; but by our lives we recall our arguments, and strengthen their wilfull opposition. For there was certainly a promise, that when Christ should come, *the wolf should dwell with the lambe, and the leopard should lie down with the kid, and the calf, and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child should lead them*; that is, there should be so much love, unanimity, and brotherly kindnesse in the Kingdome of Christ, that all ferity and inhumanity being laid aside, the most different natures and inclinations should come to the sweetest harmony and agreement. Whereas if we look upon our selves, we must con-

18, 5.

12.

Is. 11.6.

Is. 2. 4.

fesse there was never more bitterness of spirit, more rancour of malice, more heat of contention, more manifest symptomes of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, then in those which make profession of the Christian faith. It was infallibly foretold, that *when the law should go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, they should beat their swords into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation should not lift up sword against nation, neither should they learn warre any more.* Whereas there is no other Art so much studied, so much applauded, so violently asserted, not onely as lawfull, but as necessary. Look upon the face of Christendome divided into severall Kingdomes and Principalities; what are all these, but so many publick enemies, either exercising or designing warre? The Church was not more famous, or did more encrease by the first blood was shed in the primitive times, through the externall violence of ten persecutions, then now 'tis infamous, and declines through constant violence, fraud and rapine, through publick engagements of the greatest Empires in armes, through civile and intestine warres, and lest any way of shedding Christian blood should be unassayed, even by Massacres. It was likewise prophecied of the dayes of the *Messias*, that all Idolatry should totally cease, that all false teachers should be cut off, and unclean spirits restrained. And can we think that the *Jewes*, who really abhorre the thoughts of worshipping an image, can ever be perswaded there is no Idolatry committed in the Christian Church? Or can we excuse our selves in the least degree from the plague of the locusts of *Egypt*, the false teachers? Can so many schismes and sects arise, and spread? can so many heresies be acknowledged & countenanced, without false Prophets, and unclean spirits? If then we would return to the bond of true Christian love and charity, if we would appear true lovers of peace and tranquillity, if we would truly hate the abominations of Idolatry, false doctrine
and

Zach. 13. 2.

and heresy, let us often remember what we ever professe in our Creed, that *Jesus is the Christ*, that the Kingdome of the *Messias* cannot consist with these impieties.

Thirdly, the necessity of this Belief appeareth in respect of those Offices which belong to *Jesus*, as he is the *Christ*. We must look upon him as upon the Prophet anointed by God to preach the Gospel, that we may be incited to hear and embrace his doctrine. Though *Moses* and *Elias* be together with him in the Mount, yet the voice from heaven speaketh of none but *Jesus hear ye him*. *Mat. 17. 5.* He is that Wisdome the *delight of God*, crying in the *Proverbs*, *Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doores. I here* *Prov. 8. 34.* *is one thing needfull*, saith our Saviour, and *Mary chose* *Luk. 10.* *that good part, who sate at Jesus feet, and heard his* *39, 42.* *word*. Which devout posture teacheth us as a willingnesse to hear, so a readinesse to obey: and the proper effect which the Belief of this Prophetical Office worketh in us, is our *Obedience of faith*. We must consider him as our High Priest, that we may adde Confidence to that Obedience. For we have *boldnesse to enter into the Holiest* *Heb. 10. 19,* *by the blood of Jesus*; and *having an High Priest over* *21, 22, 23.* *the house of God, we may draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, and hold fast the profession of it without wavering*. And as this breedeth an adherence and assurance in us, so it requireth a resignation of us. For if Christ have redeemed us, we are his; if he died for us, it was that we should live to him; if we be *bought* *1 Cor. 6. 20.* *with a price*, we are no longer our own; but we must *glorifie God in our body and in our spirit, which are Gods*. Again, an apprehension of him as a King is necessary for the performance of our true and entire allegiance to him. *Send the lamb of the Ruler of the earth, do him homage, If. 16. 1.* acknowledge him your King, shew your selves faithfull and obedient subjects. We can pretend, and he hath re-

Mat. 28.
18, 20.

quired, no lesse. As soon as he let the Apostles understand that *All power was given unto him in heaven and in earth*, he charged them to teach all nations, to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them. Can we imagine he should so strictly injoyne subjection to higher powers, the highest of whom are here below, and that he doth not expect exact obedience to him who is exalted farre above all principalities and powers, and is set down at the right hand of God? It is observable, that in the description of the coming of the Son of man, it is said, *The King shall say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdome prepared for you*: which title as it secures our hope, in respect of his power; as it magnifies our reward by the excellency of our inheritance; so also it teacheth us the indispensable condition of obedience.

Mat. 25, 34.

Fourthly, the belief of *Jesus the Christ* is necessary to instruct us what it is to be a Christian, and how farre we stand obliged by owning that name. Those who did first embrace the faith were stiled *Disciples*, (as when the number of *Disciples* was multiplied,) or *Believers*, or *Brethren*, or *men of the Church*, or *callers upon the name of Christ*, or *men of the way*, or by their enemies *Nazarens*, and *Galileans*. But in a short time they gained a name derived from their Saviour, though not from that

Act. 6. 1, 7.

* For when our Saviour gave that command to his Apostles, *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, go make

all nations disciples: they which delivered the Gospel were *μαθητεύοντες*; they which were taught it and received it were at that time *μαθητευόμενοι*, and after by a name habituall *μαθηταί*, translated by Tertull. *Discipules*, ordinarily *Discipuli*. *Μαθητὴς ἔν ἐστιν, ὡς μαθηάτομαι παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου προσερχομαι, ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ, τῶν ἐν ἀκούῃ καὶ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, πνεύματι τε καὶ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ ὡς δεσπότῃ, καὶ βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἰατρῷ, καὶ διδασκάλῳ ἀληθείας, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου.* Thus then in the language of the Scriptures, *μαθητεύειν τινὰ* is to make a disciple; as *μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοί*, Act. 14. 21. *μαθητεύουν τινὲς*, is to be a disciple, as Joseph of Arimathea *ἐμαθήτευσε τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. *μαθητευθῆναι* the same; *μαθητευθῆναι τοῦ Κυρίου* is often used by S. Basil de Baptismate, whose title is, *Ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθητευθῆναι τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τότε καταξιοθῆναι τὴν ἀγίαν βαπτίσματα*

name

σῶμας, according to our Saviours method. Hence those which were first converted to the faith were called μαθηταί, as the Disciples of Christ their Doctour & Master. † οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, as when Herod stretched forth his hand κακῶσαι τινας ἄνδρας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, to mischief some of those which were of the Church. || As when Saul went down to Damascus with a commission, ὅπως εἰδὼς τινας ἄνδρας τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἀνδραῖ τε καὶ γυναικάς, δεδωμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Act. 9. 2. we translate it, any of this way, when there was no way mentioned to which the pronoun this should have relation; nor is ἡ ὁδὸς in Greek any more then the way. So when S. Paul went to the Synagogue at Corinth, divers were hardened and believed not, κακολογῶντας τὴν ὁδὸν ὁνόμαζον τὴν πλάνην. Act. 19. 9. here we translate it, spoke evil of that way; but Beza has left his Articulus pronominis vice fungitur, which he had from Erasmus, and hath otherwise supplied it, male loquentes de via Dei. and the Old Translation, which in the former had hujus viæ, in this hath simply maledicentes viæ. and certainly ἡ ὁδὸς is nothing but the way. Again, at Ephesus, ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον τέρας καὶ σημεῖον ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ. Act. 19. 23. de via, V. Transl. Beza again ob viam Dei. but it is nothing but the way. Thus Felix put off S. Paul, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, till he had a more exact knowledge of the way. V. Tr. de via hac. Beza, ad lectum istam. whereas then the phrase is so simply and so frequently the same, it can be nothing else but the word then in use, to signify the religion which the Christians professed. And so some also of the Ancients seem to have spoken, as appears by the language of the Melchizedecians, Χριστὸς ἐξολέγειν ἵνα ἡμεῖς καλίσσῃ ἐκ πολλῶν ὁδῶν εἰς μίαν ταύτην τὴν ῥῶσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ὁδῶν οἱ δούλων, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἡμῶν τὴν ὁδόν.

name of his which signifieth Salvation; for from Christ they were called Christians. A title so honourable, and of such concernment, that S. Luke hath thought fit to mention the City in which that name first was heard.

* And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch, as the Scriptures assure us; so named by Euodius the Bishop of that place, as Ecclesiasticall History informs us. A name no sooner invented, but embraced by all believers, as bearing the most proper signification of their Profession, and relation to the Authour and Master whom they served. In which the Primitive Christian

* S. L. kenoteth the place, but neither time when, nor person by whom this name was given. Tertullian seems to make it as an-

cient as the reign of Tiberius, Apolog. c. 3. Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in sæculum introivit. But I conceive indeed he speaks not of the name, but of the Religion: for so he may well be thought to expound himself, saying soon after, census istius disciplinæ, ut jam edidimus, à Tiberio est. c. 7. However, the name of Christian is not so ancient as Tiberius, no, as I think, as Caius. Some ancient Au-

hour in Suidas assures us, that it was first named in the reign of Claudius, when S. Peter had ordained Euodius Bishop of Antioch. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ Κλαυδίῳ βασιλείῳ Ῥώμης Πέτρος τῷ ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσας τὸν Εὐόδιον, μετονομάσας αὐτὸν οἱ πολλοὶ λεγόμενοι Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι, Χριστιανοί. Suid. in Ναζωραῖοι & in Χριστιανοί And Iohannes Antiochenus confirms not onely the time, but tells us that Euodius the Bishop was the author of the name. Καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ (Κλαυδίῳ) Χριστιανοὶ ὀνομάσθησαν, τῷ αὐτῷ ὁπισκόπῳ Εὐόδιῳ προσομιλήσαντες αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα τούτου προῖον καὶ Ναζωραῖοι καὶ Γαλιλαῖοι ἐκαλεῖντο οἱ Χριστιανοί. Thus the name of Christian was first brought into use at Antioch, by Euodius the Bishop of the place, and hath ever since been continued as the most proper appellation which could be given unto our profession, being derived from the author and finisher of our faith. At nunc Secta oditur in nomine uique sui auctoris. Quid novi si aliqua disciplina de Magistro cognomentum sectatoribus suis inducit? Nonne Philosophi de auctoribus suis nuncupantur Platonici, Epicurei, Pythagorici? Etiam a locis conuenticulorum & stationum suarum Sectici, Academicici? Neque Medici ab Erasistrato, & Grammatici ab Aristarcho, Codi etiam ab Apicio? Neque tamen quenquam offendit professio nominis cum institutione transmissa ab institutore. Tertull. Apolog. c. 3.

† As we read of Sanctus a Deacon at Vienne in a hot persecution of the French Church, who being in the midst of tortures, was troubled with

ans so much delighted, that before the face of their enemies they would acknowledge † no other name but that, though hated, reviled, tormented, martyred for it. Nor is this name of greater honour to us, then of obligation. There are two parts of the seal of the foundation of God, and one of them is this, * *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* It was a common answer of the ancient Martyr, * *I am a Christian, and with us no evil is done.* The very name was thought to

severall questions, which the Gentiles usually then asked, to try if they could extort any confession of any wicked actions practised secretly by the Christians, yet would not give any other answer to any question, then that he was a Christian. τοσούτῃ περιστάσει ἀντιπαρετάξατο αὐτοῖς, ὥστε μὴτε τὸ ἴδιον καταποιῆν ὄνομα μὴτε ὅτι μὴτε πόλεως ὅθεν ἦν, μὴτε οἱ δούλος ἢ ἐλεύθερος εἶν· ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐρωτώμενα ἀπεκρίνατο τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ φωνῇ, Χριστιανός εἰμι. τούτο καὶ ἀντὶ ὀνόματος, καὶ ἀντὶ πόλεως, καὶ ἀντὶ γένους, καὶ ἀντὶ παντὸς ἐπαλλήλως ὁμολογῶν. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1. The same doth S. Chrysostome testify of S. Lucian, πῶς αὖ πατρίδος; Χριστιανός εἰμι ὁσι. τί ἔχεις ἐπιπιδεῖν; Χριστιανός εἰμι. τίνας περὶ γένους; ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἀπαντα ἔλεγεν, ὅτι Χριστιανός εἰμι. 22 Tim. 1. 19. So Blandina in the French persecution. ἦν αὐτῆς ἀνάληψις καὶ ἀνάπαυσις καὶ ἀναλγησία καὶ συμβαλόντων, τὸ λέγειν ὅτι Χριστιανὴ εἰμι, καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐ φῶλον γίνεται. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1.

speak

speak something of * emendation; and whosoever put it
 on, became the better man. Except such reformation
 accompany our profession, there is no † advantage in the
 appellation; nor can we be honoured by that title, while
 we dishonour him that gives it. If he be therefore called
 Christ, because anointed; as we derive the name of Chri-
 stian, so do we receive our unction from him. For as
 a the precious ointment upon the head ran down upon the
 beard, even Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts
 of his garments: so the Spirit which without measure
 was poured upon Christ our head, is by him diffused
 through all the members of his * body. For b God hath
 established and anointed us in Christ: c We have an un-
 ction from the Holy one, and the anointing which we have
 received from him abideth in us. Necessary then it cannot
 chuse but be, that we should know *Jesus* to be the Christ:
 because as he is *Jesus*, that is, our Saviour, by being *Christ*,
 that is, anointed; so we can have no share in him as *Jesus*,
 except we become truly *Christians*, and so be in him as
Christ, anointed with that unction from the Holy One.

* Alii quos
 ante hoc no-
 men vagos, vi-
 les, improbos
 noverant, ex
 ipso denotant
 quod laudant,
 cæcitate odii
 in suffragium
 impingunt.
 Quæ mulier?
 quam lasciva!
 quam festiva!
 qui juvenis?
 quam lascivus!
 quam amarius!
 facti sunt Chri-
 stiani, ita no-
 men emenda-
 tionis impu-
 tatur. Tertul.
 † Totum in id
 revolvitur, ut
 qui Christiani
 nominis opus

non agit, Christianus non esse videatur. Nomen enim sine actu atque officio suo
 nihil est. *Salvian. de Prov. l. 4.* 'Εάν τις τὸ ὄνομα λαβὼν τῷ Χριστιανισμῷ ἐνυ-
 βέλῃ τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ δὲν ὀφείλῃ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς μετσημερίας. *S. Basil. ad Am-
 philoch.* Christianus vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur.
Tertull. Apolog. c. 3. * Inde apparet Christi corpus nos esse, qui omnes unguimur,
 & omnes in illo & Christi, & Christus sumus, quis quodammodo totus Christus caput
 & corpus est. *S. August. in Psal. 26. a Psal. 133. 2. b 2 Cor. 1. 21. c 1 Jo. 2. 20, 27.*

Thus having run through all the particulars at first
 designed for the explication of the title *Christ*, we may
 at last clearly expresse, and every Christian easily under-
 stand, what it is we say when we make our Confession in
 these words, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. I do assent unto
 this as a certain truth, that there was a man promised by
 God, foretold by the Prophets to be the *Messias*, the
 Redeemer of *Israel*, and the expectation of the Nati-
 ons.

ons. I am fully assured by all those predictions that the *Messias* so promised is already come. I am as certainly perswaded, that the man born in the dayes of *Herod* of the Virgin *Mary*, by an Angel from heaven called *Jesus*, is that true *Messias*, so long, so often promised. that as the *Messias* he was anointed to three especiall offices, belonging to him as the Mediatour between God and man: that he was a Prophet, revealing unto us the whole will of God for the salvation of man; that he was a Priest, and hath given himself a sacrifice for sin, and so hath made an atonement for us; that he is a King set down at the right hand of God, farre above all principalities and powers, whereby when he hath subdued all our enemies, he will conferre actuall, perfect, and eternall happinesse upon us. I believe this Unction by which he became the true *Messias*, was not performed by any materiall oyl, but by the Spirit of God, which he received as the Head, and conveyeth to his members. And in this full acknowledgement *I believe in Jesus Christ*.

HIS ONLY SON.

AFTER our Saviours Nomination immediately followeth his Filiation: and justly, after we have acknowledged him to be *the Christ*, do we confesse him to be the *Son of God*; because these two were ever inseparable, and even by the *Jewes* themselves accounted equivalent. Thus *Nathanael*, that true *Israelite*, maketh his confession of the *Messias*; *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel*. Thus *Martina* makes expression of her faith; *I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world*. Thus the High Priest maketh his inquisition; *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God*. This was the famous

Con-

Confession of S. Peter; *We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.* And the Gospel of S. John was therefore written, that *we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.* Certain then it is that all the *Jewes*, as they looked for a *Messias* to come, so they believed that *Messias* to be the Son of God: and that by reason of a constant interpretation of the second Psalm, as appropriated unto him. Well therefore after we have expressed our faith in *Jesus Christ*, is added that which always had so great affinity with it, the *only Son of God*.

In these words there is little variety to be observed, except that what we translate the *only Son*, that in the phrase of the Scripture and the Greek Church, is the *only-begotten*. It is then sufficient for the explication of these words, to shew how *Christ* is the Son of God, and what is the peculiarity of his Generation; that when others are also the sons of God, he alone should so be his Son, as no other is or can be so; and therefore he alone should have the name of the *only-begotten*.

† The Latines indeed generally use the word *Unicum*. So Rufinus; Et in unico filio ejus. which is so farre from being in his apprehension the same with uni-

genitus, that he reserves it as well to Lord as Son. Hic ergo Jesus Christus, filius unicus Dei, qui est & Dominus noster unicus. & ad filium referri, & ad dominum potest. So S. Aug. in Enchiridio, c. 34. and Leo Epist. 10. Which is therefore to be observed, because in the ancient Copies of these Epistles the word *unicum* was not to be found; as appeareth by the discourse of Vigilius, who in the fourth book against Eutyches hath these words: Illa primitus uno diluens volumine, quæ Leonis obijciuntur Epistolæ, cujus hoc sibi primo capitulum iste nescio quis proposuit; Fidelium Universitas profueretur credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, & in Jesum Christum filium ejus Dominum nostrum. That which he aims at is the tenth Epistle of Leo, in which these words are found, but with the addition of *unicum*, which, as it seems, then was not there: as appeares yet farther by the words which follow. Miror tamen quomodo hunc locum iste notavit, & illum prætermisit, ubi unici filii commemorationem idem Beatus Leo facit, dicens, Idem vero sempiterni genitoris unigenitus sempiternus, natus de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine. which words are to be found in the same Epistle. Howsoever it was in the first copies of Leo, both Rufinus and S. Augustine, who were before him, and Maximus Taurinensis, Chrysologus, Etherius and Beatus, who were later, read it, & in Jesum Christum filium ejus unicum. But the word used in the Scriptures, and kept constantly by the Greeks, is *μονογενής*, the *only-begotten*.

First then, it cannot be denied that *Christ* is the Son of God, for that reason, because he was begotten by the Spirit of God of the Virgin *Mary*; for that which is conceived (or rather † begotten) in her, by the testimony of an Angel, is of the Holy Ghost; and because of him, therefore the Son of God. For so spake the Angel to the Virgin; *The holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee (or rather which is begotten of thee) shall be called the Son of God.* And the reason is clear, because that Holy Ghost is God. For were he any Creature, and not God himself, who thus begat our Saviour of the Virgin, he must have been the Son of a Creature, not of God.

† For the Originall is τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν. and 'tis the observation of S. Basil, ὅτι ἐγενταί τὸ κυνδέν, ἀλλὰ τὸ γεννηθέν. Indeed the vulgar translation renders it, quod in ea natum est, and in S. Luke, quod nascetur sanctum; and it must be confessed this was the ancient translation. For so Tertullian read it, Per virginem dicitis natum, non ex virgine, & in vulva, non ex vulva, quia & Angelus in somnis ad Joseph. Nam quod in ea natum est, inquit, de Sp. S. est. De Carne Christi, c. 19. and of this in S. Luke, Hæc & ab Angelo exceperat secundum nostrum Evangelium, Propter quod in te nascetur vocabitur sanctum, filius Dei. Aiv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 7. Yet quod in ea natum est cannot be proper, while it is yet in the wombe; nor can the child first be said to be born, and then that the mother shall bring it forth. 'Tis true indeed, γεννᾶν signifies not alwayes to beget, but sometimes to bear or bring forth. as ἡ γυνὴ ἐλίσσεται γεννήσαι υἱόν Cor. Luk. 1. 23. and v. 57. καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν. So ἡ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ, Mat. 2. 1. must necessarily be understood of Christs nativity, for it is most certain that he was not begot at Bethlehem, and this without question must be the meaning of Herods inquisition, πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, where the Messias was to be born. But though γεννᾶν have sometime the signification of bearing or bringing forth; yet τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν cannot be so interpreted, because it speaks of something as past, when as yet Christ was not born: and though the conception was already past, and we translate it so, which is conceived; yet S. Basil rejects that interpretation. γεννᾶν is one thing, συλλαμβάνειν another. Seeing then the Nativity was not yet come, and γεννηθέν speaks of something already past, therefore the Old Translation is not good, quod in ea natum est. Seeing though the conception indeed were past, yet γεννᾶν significeth not to conceive, and is not properly to be interpreted, that which is conceived; seeing γεννᾶν is most properly to beget, as ἡ γεννητικὴ the generative faculty: therefore I conceive the first interpretation of those words τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν that which is begotten in her. And because the Angel in S. Luke speaks of the same thing, therefore I interpret γεννώμενον ἐκ σῶ, in the same manner, that which is begotten of thee.

Secondly,

Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same *Christ* thus begotten by the Spirit of God, was designed to so high an Office by the speciall and immediate will of God, that by vertue thereof he must be acknowledged the *Son of God*. He urgeth this argument himself against the *Jewes*. *Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods?* Are not these the very words of the eighty second *Psalme*? *If he called them Gods*, if God himself so spake, or the *Psalmist* from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they be called Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, nor the authority thereof in any particular denied; *Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world*, whom he hath consecrated and commissioned to the most eminent and extraordinary Office, *say ye of him, thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

Thirdly, *Christ* must therefore be acknowledged the Son of God, because he is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortall life. For God hath fulfilled the promise unto us, in that he hath raised up *Aff. 13. 33.* *Jesus* again; as it is also written in the second *Psalme*, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*. The grave is as the wombe of the earth; *Christ* who is raised from thence, is as it were begotten to another life, and God who raised him is his Father. So true it must needs be of him, which is spoken of others, who are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Thus *Luk. 20. 36.* was he defin'd or constituted, and appointed the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead: neither is he called simply the first that rose, but with a note of generation, the first-born from the dead. *Rom. 1. 4.* *Colos. 1. 18.*

Fourthly, *Christ*, after his resurrection from the dead, is made actually heir of all things in his Fathers house, and Lord of all the Spirits which minister unto him, from whence he also hath the title of the Son of God. *He is*

Heb. 1. 3, 4, 5. set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, being made so much better then the Angels; as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name then they. For unto which of the Angels said he at any time, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?* From all which testimonies of the Scriptures it is evident, that *Christ* hath this four-fold right unto the title of the Son of God: by generation, as begotten of God; by commission, as sent by him; by resurrection, as the first-born; by actual possession, as heir of all.

Luk. 3. 38.

But beside these four, we must find yet a more peculiar ground of our Saviour's Filiation, totally distinct from any which belongs unto the rest of the Sons of God, that he may be clearly and fully acknowledged the *only-begotten Son*. For although to be born of a Virgin be in it self miraculous, and justly entitles *Christ* unto the Son of God; yet is it not so farre above the production of all mankind, as to place him in that singular eminence which must be attributed to the *only-begotten*. We read of *Adam the Son of God*, as well as *Seth* the son of *Adam*: and surely the framing *Christ* out of a woman, cannot so farre transcend the making *Adam* out of the earth, as to cause so great a distance, as we must believe between the first and second *Adam*. Beside, there were many while our Saviour preached on earth, who did believe his doctrine, and did confesse him to be the Son of God, who in all probability understood nothing of his being born of a Virgin; much lesse did they foresee his rising from the dead, or inheriting all things. Wherefore supposing all these wayes by which *Christ* is represented to us as the Son of God, we shall find out one more yet, farre more proper in it self, and more peculiar unto him, in which no other Son can have the least pretence of share or of similitude, and consequently in respect of which we must confesse him the *Only-begotten*.

To which purpose I observe, that the actuall possession of his inheritance, which was our fourth title to his Sonship, presupposeth his resurrection, which was the third: and his commission to his Office, which was the second, presupposeth his generation of a Virgin as the first. But I shall now endeavour to find another generation, by which the same *Christ* was begotten, and consequently a Son, before he was conceived in the Virgins wombe. Which that I may be able to evince, I shall proceed in this following method, as not onely most facile and perspicuous, but also most convincing and conclusive. First, I will clearly prove out of the holy Scriptures, that *Jesus Christ*, born of the Virgin *Mary*, had an actuall being or subsistence before the Holy Ghost did come upon the Virgin, or the power of the Highest did overshadow her. Secondly, I will demonstrate from the same Scriptures, that the being which he had antecedently to his conception in the Virgins wombe, was not any created being, but essentially divine. Thirdly, we will shew that the divine essence which he had, he received as communicated to him by the Father. Fourthly, we will declare this communication of the divine nature to be a proper generation, by which he which communicateth is a proper Father, and he to whom it is communicated, a proper Son. Lastly, we will manifest that the divine essence was never communicated in that manner to any person but to him, that never any was so begotten besides himself, and consequently, in respect of that divine generation, he is most properly and perfectly *the onely-begotten Son of the Father*.

As for the first, that *Jesus Christ* had a reall being or existence, by which he truly was, before he was conceived of the Virgin *Mary*, I thus demonstrate. He which was really in Heaven, and truly descended from thence, and came into the world from the Father, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended into

speaks; and being in heaven before this ascension, he must be acknowledged to have been there before he ascended at all. If *Christ* had ascended into heaven before his death, and descended from thence, it had been the most remarkable action in all his life, and the proof thereof of the greatest efficacy toward the disseminating of the Gospel. And can we imagine so divine an action of so high concernment could have passed, and none of the Evangelists ever make mention of it? Those which are so diligent in the description of his nativity and circumcision, his oblation in the temple, his reception by *Simeon*, his adoration by the wise men; those which have described his descent into *Egypt*; would they have omitted his ascent into heaven? Do they tell us of the wisdom which he shewed when he disputed with the Doctors; and were it not worthy our knowledge whether it were before he was in heaven or after? The diligent seeking of *Joseph* and *Mary*, and her words when they found him, *Son, why hast thou dealt so with us?* shew *Luk. 2. 48.* that he had not been missing from them till then, and consequently not ascended into heaven. After that he went down to *Nazareth*, and was subject to them: and I understand not how he should ascend into heaven, and at the same time be subject to them, or there receive his Commission and Instructions as the great Legate of God, or Embassadour from heaven, and return again unto his old subjection; and afterwards to go to *John* to be baptized of him, and to expect the descent of the Spirit for his inauguration. Immediately from *Jordan* he is carried into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil: and 'twere strange if any time could then be found for his Ascension; for *he was forty dayes in the wilderness*, *Mark 1. 13.* and certainly heaven is no such kind of place; he was all that time *with the beasts*, who undoubtedly are none of the celestially Hierarchy; and tempted of *Satan*, whose dominion reacheth no higher then the air. Wherefore
in

Mark 1. 13.

Luk. 4. 14.

Heb. 9. 24.

7.

in those forty dayes *Christ* ascended not into heaven, but rather heaven descended unto him, for *the Angels ministred unto him*. After this he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and there exercised his prophetical Office: after which there is not the least pretence of any reason for his ascension. Beside, the whole frame of this antecedent or preparatory Ascension of *Christ*, is not onely raised without any written testimony of the word, or unwritten testimony of tradition, but is without any reason in it self, and contrary to the revealed way of our Redemption. For what reason should *Christ* ascend into heaven to know the will of God, and not be known to ascend thither? Certainly the Father could reveal his will unto the Son as well on earth as in heaven. And if men must be ignorant of his ascension, to what purpose should they say he ascended, except they imagine either an impotency in the Father, or dissatisfaction in the Son? Nor is this onely asserted without reason, but also against that rule to be observed by *Christ* as he was anointed to the Sacerdotall Office. For the Holy of holies made with hands was the figure of the true, (that is *heaven it self*) into which the *High Priest alone went once every year*; and *Christ* as our High Priest *entred in once into the holy place*. If then they deny *Christ* was a Priest, before he preached the Gospel, then did he not enter into heaven, because the High Priest alone went into the type thereof, the Holy of holies. If they confesse he was, then did he not ascend till after his death, because he was to enter in but *once*, and that not without blood. Wherefore being *Christ* ascended not into heaven till after his death, being he certainly was in heaven before that ascension, we have sufficiently made good that part of our Argument, that *Jesus Christ* was in heaven before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither. Now that which followeth will both illustrate and confirm it; for as he was there, so he descended from thence before he ascended thither.

thither. This he often testifieth and inculcateth of himself. *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven.* and, *I am the living bread which came down from heaven.* He opposeth himself unto the Manna in the

wildernesse, which never was really in heaven, or had its originall from thence. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven :* but the Father gave *Christ* really from thence.

Wherefore he saith, *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* Now never any person upon any occasion is said to descend from heaven, but such as were really there before they appeared on earth, as the Father, the Holy Ghost, and the Angels : but no man, however born, however sanctified, sent, or dignified, is said thereby to descend from thence ; but rather when any is oppos'd to *Christ*, the opposition is placed in this very origination. *John* the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mothers wombe ; born of an aged father and a barren mother, by the power of God : and yet he distinguisheth himself from *Christ* in this ; *He that cometh from above* *Job. 3. 31.* *is above all ; he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth, he that cometh from heaven is above all.*

Adam was framed immediately by God, without the intervention of man or woman ; and yet he is so farre from being thereby from heaven, that even in that he is distinguished from the second *Adam*. For *the first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven.* Wherefore the descent of *Christ* from heaven doth really presuppose his being there, and that antecedently to any ascent thither. For *that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended first ?*

So *S. Paul* asserting a descent as necessarily preceding his ascension, teacheth us never to imagine an ascent of *Christ* as his first motion between heaven and earth ; and consequently, that the first being or existence which *Christ* had, was not what he received by his con-

Jo. 16. 27, 28.

ception here on earth, but what he had before in heaven, in respect whereof he was with the Father, from whom he came. His disciples believed that he *came out from God*, and he commended that faith, and confirmed the object of it by this assertion; *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* Thus having by undoubted testimonies made good the later part of the Argument, I may safely conclude, that being *Christ* was really in heaven, and descended from thence, and came forth from the Father, before that which was conceived of the Holy Ghost ascended thither; it cannot with any shew of reason be denied, that *Christ* had a reall being and existence antecedent unto his conception here on earth, and distinct from the being which he received here.

Joh. 1. 15.

Secondly, we shall prove not onely a bare priority of existence, but a preexistence of some certain and acknowledged space of duration. For whosoever was before *John* the Baptist, and before *Abraham*, was some space of time before *Christ* was man. This no man can deny, because all must confesse, the blessed *Virgin* was first saluted by the Angel six moneths after *Elizabeth* conceived, and many hundred yeares after *Abraham* died. But *Jesus Christ* was really existent before *John* the Baptist, and before *Abraham*, as we shall make good by the testimony of the Scriptures. Therefore it cannot be denied but *Christ* had a reall being and existence some space of time before he was made man. For the first, it is the expresse testimony of *John* himself. *This is he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.* In which words, First, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of *Christ*, *he that cometh after me*: for so he came after him into the wombe, at his conception; into the world, at his nativity; unto his office, at his baptism; alwayes after *John*, and at the same distance. Secondly, he attributeth unto

u'to *Christ* a priority of dignity, saying, *he is preferred before me*; as appeareth by the reiteration of these words; *He it is who coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoes latchet I am not worthy to unloose.* The addition of which expression of his own unworthinesse, sheweth, that to *be preferred before him*, is the same with being *worthier then he*, to which the same expression is constantly added by all the other three Evangelists. Thirdly, he rendieth the reason or cause of that great dignity which belonged to *Christ*, saying, *for*, or rather, *because he was before me*. And being the cause must be supposed different and distinct from the effect, therefore the priority last mentioned cannot be that of dignity. For to assign any thing as the cause or reason of it self, is a great absurdity, and the expression of it, a vain tautology. Wherefore that priority must have relation to time or duration, (as the very tense, *he was before me*, sufficiently signifieth) and so be placed in opposition to his coming after him. As if *John* the Baptist had thus spake at large. This man *Christ Jesus*, who came into the world, and entred on his propheticall Office six moneths after me, is notwithstanding of farre more worth and greater dignity then I am; even so much greater, that I must acknowledge my self unworthy to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes: and the reason of this transcendent dignity is from the excellency of that nature which he had before I was; for though he cometh after me, yet he was before me. Now as *Christ* was before *John*, which speaks a small, so was he also before *Abraham*, which speaks a larger time. *Jesus* himself hath asserted this preexistence to the *Jewes*; *Verily verily, I say unto you, before* *Joh. 8. 58.* *Abraham was, I am.* Which words plainly and literally expounded, must evidently contain this truth. For first, *Abraham* in all the Scriptures never hath any other signification then such as denotes the person called by that name; and the question to which these words are directed

ed by way of answer, without controversy spake of the same person. Beside *Abraham* must be the subject of that proposition, *Abraham was*; because a proposition cannot be without a subject, and if *Abraham* be the predicate, there is none. Again, as we translate *Abraham was*, in a tense signifying the time past, so it is most certainly to be understood, because that which he speaks unto is the preexistence of *Abraham*, and that of long duration: so that whatsoever had concerned his present estate or future condition, had been wholly impertinent to the precedent question. Lastly, the expression *I am*, seeming something unusuall or imptoper to signifie a priority in respect of any thing past, because no present instant is before that which precedeth, but that which followeth: yet the * use of it sufficiently maintaineth, and the nature of the place absolutely requireth, that it should not here denote a present being, but a priority of existence, together with a continuation of it till the present time.

* So Nonnus
here more
briefly and
plainly then
usuall; Ἀβρα-

ἀμ. πρὶν γένος

ἔχον, ἐγὼ πάλιν. So Jo. 14. 19. πᾶν τὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς; Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me? and Jo. 15. 27. ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμῶν εἰσι, because ye have been (or continued) with me from the beginning. Thus Nonnus, Εξ ἀρχῆς μετὰ πάντας ὁλων θνήσκοντες ἔσμεν. Job. 6. 24. Ὅταν ἐν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ. When the people saw that Jesus was not there. Nor onely doth S. John use thus the present tense for that which is past, but as frequently for that which is to come. For as before, τῷ χρόνῳ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, so on the contrary, ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. Job. 7. 33. and ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ δίδων καὶ ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται. Job. 11. 16. 14. 3. 17. 24. wherefore it is very indifferent whether (Job. 7. 34.) we read ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, or ὅπου ἔσμαι. For Nonnus seems to have read ἔσμαι by his translation, οἱς ἀπεκρινεν ἡνὶκα ὁ δούλων; and the Jewes question, πῶ ἔστι μὴδ' ἀπεκρινεῖς; shewes they understood it so: for this ἔσμαι though of a present form, is of a future signification. Helyc. Εἰμι, πορεύομαι. And so it agreeth with that which follows, Jo. 8. 21. ὅπου ἐγὼ παρῶ, ὑμεῖς ἔσδωκετε ἐλθόν. If we read εἰμι, as the Old Translation, ubi ego sum, it will have the force of ἔσομαι, and agree with the other; ἔνα ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσδε. Howsoever it is clear, S. John useth the present εἰμι either in relation to what is past, or what is to come, and is therefore to be interpreted as the matter in hand requireth. And certainly the place now under our consideration, can admit no other relation but to the time already past.

And

in which Abraham lived. And we find the present tense in the same manner joined with the Aorist elsewhere: as Psal. 90. 2. *πρὸ τοῦ ὅτε γεννηθῆναι καὶ πλασθῆναι τὴν γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ ἀπὸ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος*, σὺ εἶ. What can be more parallel then *πρὸ τοῦ ὅτε γεννηθῆναι τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀβραάμ γεννῆσθαι*, and *ὅτε εἶναι*. In the same manner, though by another word, *πρὸ τοῦ ὅτε ἐγεννήθηναι*, *πρὸ δὲ πάντων γεννῆσθαι*. Prov. 8. 25.

And then the words will plainly signifie thus much. Do you question how I could see *Abraham*, who am not yet fifty yeares old? Verily verily, I say unto you, Before ever *Abraham*, the person whom you speak of, was born, I had a reall being and existence, (by which I was capable of the sight of him) in which I have continued untill now. In this sense certainly the *Jewes* understood our Saviours answer, as pertinent to their question, but in their opinion blasphemous, and therefore they took up stones to cast at him. This literall and plain explication is yet further necessary; because those which once recede from it, do not only wrest and pervert the place, but also invent and suggest an answer unworthy of, and wholly misbecoming him that spake it. For setting aside the addition, of the *light of the world*, which there can be no shew of reason to admit; whether they interpret the former part of something to come, as the calling of the *Gentiles*, or the later of a preexistence in the divine foreknowledge and appointment; they represent *Christ* with a great asseveration highly and strongly asserting that, which is nothing to the purpose to which he speaks, nothing to any other purpose at all: and they propound the *Jewes* senselessly offended and foolishly exasperated with those words, which any of them might have spoken as well as he. For the first interpretation maketh our Saviour thus to speak. Do ye so much wonder how I should have seen *Abraham*, who am not yet fifty yeares old? do ye imagine so great a contradiction in this? I tell you, and be ye most assured that what I speak un-

to you at this time is most certainly and infallibly true, and most worthy of your observation, which moves me not to deliver it without this solemn asseveration; before *Abraham* shall perfectly become that which was signified in his name, *the father of many Nations*, before the *Gentiles* shall come in, *I am*. Nor be ye troubled at this answer, or think in this I magnifie my self: for what I speak is as true of you as 'tis of me; before *Abraham* be thus made *Abraham*, ye are. Doubt ye not therefore, as ye did, nor ever make that question again, whether I *have seen Abraham*. The second explication makes a sense of another nature, but with the same impertinency. Do ye continue still to question, and that with so much admiration? do ye look upon my age, and ask, *hast thou seen Abraham*? I confesse 'tis more then eighteen hundred yeares since that Patriarch died, and lesse then forty since I was born at *Bethlehem*: but look not on this computation, for before *Abraham* was born, I was. But mistake me not; I mean in the foreknowledge and decree of God. Nor do I magnifie my self in this, for ye were so. How either of these answers should give any reasonable satisfaction to the question, or the least occasion of the *Jewes* exasperation, is not to be understood. And that our Saviour should speak any such impertinencies as these interpretations bring forth, is not by a Christian to be conceived. Wherefore being the plain and most obvious sense is a proper and full answer to the question, and most likely to exasperate the unbelieving *Jewes*; being those strained explications render the words of *Christ* not onely impertinent to the occasion, but vain and uselesse to the hearers of them; being our Saviour gave this answer in words of another language, most probably uncapable of any such interpretations; we must adhere unto that literall sense already deliver'd, by which it appeareth *Christ* had a being, as before *John*, so also before *Abraham*, and consequently that he did exist

two thousand yeares before he was born, or begotten of the Virgin.

Thirdly, we shall extend this preexistence to a farre longer space of time, to the end of the first world, nay to the beginning of it. For he which was before the flood, and at the creation of the world, had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin. But *Christ* was really before the flood, for he preached to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for he created it. That he preached to those before the flood, is evident by the words of *S. Peter*, who saith, that *Christ* was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit, by which *1 Pet. 3. 13,*
also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which 19, 20.
 sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the dayes of Noah while the ark was a preparing. From which words it appeareth, that *Christ* preached by the same Spirit by the vertue of which he was raised from the dead: but that Spirit was not his Soul, but something of a greater power. Secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, while the ark was preparing. It is certain then that *Christ* did preach unto those persons which in the dayes of *Noah* were disobedient all that time the long-suffering of God waited, and consequently so long as repentance was offer'd. And it is as certain that he never preached to them after they died; which I shall not need here to prove, because those against whom I bring this Argument, deny it not. It followeth therefore, that he preached to them while they lived, and were disobedient; for in the refusing of that mercy which was offered to them by the preaching of *Christ*, did their disobedience principally consist. In vain then are we taught to understand *S. Peter* of the promulgation of the Gospel to the *Gentiles* after the Holy Ghost descended upon the *Apostles*, when the words themselves refuse

ἀπαγγέλλων
 πότε, ὅτε αὐ-
 τὸν ἐξέδιδε
 τοῖς ἡγεμένοι
 μακροθυμία
 ἐν ἡμέραις
 Νῶε.

refuse all relation to any such times or persons. For all those of whom S. Peter speaks were disobedient in the dayes of Noah. But none of those to whom the Apostles preached were ever disobedient in the dayes of Noah. Therefore none of those to which the Apostles preached, were any of those of which S. Peter speaks. It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true, that Christ did preach unto those men which lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a Prophet, by the sending of Noah, the eighth preacher of righteousness: yet to do any thing by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principall cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument. The second

2 Pet. 2. 5.

I have thus translated this place of S. Peter, because it may adde some advantage to

the argument: for if Noah were the eighth preacher of righteousness, and he were sent by the Son of God; no man, I conceive, will deny that the seven before him were sent by the same Son: and so by this we have gained the preexistence of another 1000 years. However those words, ἀλλ' ὅγδοον Νῶε δίκαιουσίνης κήρυκα ἐρύλαξε, may be better interpreted then they are, when we translate them, but saved Noah the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness. For first, if we look upon the Greek phrase, ὅγδοος Νῶε may be not the eighth person, but one of eight, or Noah with seven more; in which it signifieth not the order in which he was in respect of the rest, but onely signifieth the number which were with him. As when we read in the Supplices of Æschylus, Τὸ δὲ τεκόντων σέβας, Τείτονον τόδ' ὄν θεομύοις Δίκας ἡγήσασθαι μάλιστα, we must not understand it, as if Honour due to parents were the third Commandment at Athens, but one of the three remarkable lawes left at Eleusis by Triptolemus. So Porphyrius, Φασὶ δὲ καὶ Τετράδα μιν Ἀθηναίους νομίζεσθαι, καὶ ὅτι νόμων ἀπὸ τριῶν ἑστὶ θεοκρατίας ὁ φιλόσοφος λέγει διαμένειν Ἐλευσίνι τὸ σὸς τοὺς τιμᾶν θεὸς καρποῖς ἀγῶνων Ζῶα μὴ σίνεσθαι. De Abstin. l. 4. which words are thus translated by S. Hierome, who hath made use of most parts of that fourth book of Porphyrius, Xenocrates Philosophus de Triptolemi legibus apud Athenienses tria tantum præcepta in templo Eleusina residere scribit; Honorandos Parentes, Venerandos Deos, Carnibus non vescendum. Adver. Jovinianum, lib. 5. where we see, Honour due to parents, the first precept, though by Æschylus call'd the

third, not in respect of the order, but the number. Thus Blinarchus the Orator, *ἡ τῆς Σαυῶς δὲ αἰς ἐκείνῃ ἐγγράφῃ κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτὸς*. From whence we must not collect that the person of whom he speaks was the tenth in order of that office, so that nine were necessarily before or above him, & many more might be after or below him; but from hence it is inferred, that there were ten *ἐγγράφοι* waiting on the Σαυῶν Θεῶν, and no more, of which number that man was one. After this manner speak the Attick writers, especially Thucydides. And so we may understand S. Peter, that God preserved No. b (a preacher of righteousness) with seven more, of which he deserveth to be named the first, rather than the last or eighth. But secondly, the Ordinall *ὁγδοὺς* may possibly not belong to the name or person of Noah, but to his title or office; and then we must translate *ὁγδοὺς Νῶε διὰ τὸν ὅτιον καὶ ἔργον*, Noah the eighth preacher of righteousness. For we read at the birth of Enos that men began to call upon the name of the Lord, Gen. 4. 26. which the ancients understood peculiarly of his person: as the LXX *ἔτος ἡλποῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and the vulgar Latine, *Ita coepit invocare nomen domini*. The Jewes have a tradition, that God sent in the sea upon mankind in the dayes of Enos, and destroyed many. From whence it seems Enos was a Preacher or Prophet, and so the rest that followed him; and then Noah is the eighth.

part of the Argument, that Christ made this world, and consequently had a reall being at the beginning of it, the Scriptures manifestly and plentifully assure us. For the same Son by whom in these last dayes God spake unto us, Heb. 1. 2. is he by whom also he made the worlds. So that, as through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so must we * also believe that they were made by the Son of God. Which the Apostle doth not onely in the entrance of his Epistle deliver, but in the sequels prove. For shewing greater things have been spoken of him then ever were attributed to any of the Angels, the most glorious of all the creatures of God; among the rest, the faith, the Scripture spake a unto the Son, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. And not onely so, but also, thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest, and they all shall wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy yeares shall not fail. Now

* It being in both places expressed in the same phrase by the same Author, *ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν τῶν αἰώνων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Heb. 1. 2. *πιστὶς νοῦν κατὰ τὴν τῆς αἰῶνος πνεύματος*. Heb. 1. 8, 10, 11. 12.

whatsoever the person be to whom these words were spoken, it cannot be denied but he was the Creatour of the world. For he must be acknowledged the maker of the earth, who laid the foundation of it; and he may justly challenge to himself the making of the heavens, who can say, they are the work of his hands. But these words were spoken to the Son of God, as the Apostle himself acknowledgeth, and it appeareth out of the order and series of the chapter; the design of which is to declare the supereminent excellency of our Saviour *Christ*. Nay the conjunction *And*, referres this place of the Psalmist plainly to the former, of which he had said expressly, *but unto the Son he saith*. As sure then as *thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, was said unto the Son; so certain it is, *thou Lord hast laid the foundation of the earth*, was said unto the same. Nor is it possible to avoid the Apostles connexion by attributing the destruction of the heavens, out of the last words, to the Son, and denying the creation of them, out of the first, to the same. For it is most evident that there is but one person spoken to, and that the destruction and the creation of the heavens are both attributed to the same. Whosoever therefore shall grant that the Apostle produced this Scripture to shew that the Son of God shall destroy the heavens, must withall acknowledge that he created them: whosoever denieth him to be here spoken of as the Creatour, must also denie him to be understood as the destroyer. Wherefore being the words of the Psalmist were undoubtedly spoken of, and to our Saviour, (or else the Apostle hath attributed that unto him which never belonged to him, and consequently the Spirit of *S. Paul* mistook the Spirit of *David*;) being to whomsoever any part of them belongs, the whole is applicable, because they are delivered unto one; being the literall exposition is so clear that no man hath ever pretended to a metaphorical; it remaineth as an undeniable truth, grounded upon the profession of the Psalmist,

Plalmist, and the interpretation of an Apostle, that the Son of God created the world; Nor needed we so long to have insisted upon this testimony, because there are so many which testifie as much, but onely that this is of a peculiar nature and different from the rest. For they which deny this truth of the Creation of the world by the Son of God, notwithstanding all those Scriptures produced to confirm it, have found two wayes to avoid or decline the force of them. If they speak so plainly and literally of the work of Creation, that they will not endure any figurative interpretation, then they endeavour to shew, that they are not spoken of the Son of God: If they speak so expressly of our Saviour *Christ*, as that by no machination they can be applied to any other person, then their whole design is to make the creation, attributed unto him, appear to be merely metaphoricall. The place before alledged is of the first kind, which speaketh so clearly of the Creation, or reall production of the world, that they never denied it: and I have so manifestly shewed it spoken to the Son of God, that it is beyond all possibility of gain-saying.

Thus having asserted the creation acknowledged reall unto *Christ*, we shall the easier perswade that likewise to be such, which is pretended to be metaphoricall. In the Epistle to the *Colossians* we read of the Son of God, *in whom we have redemption through his blood;* Col. I. 14. and we are sure those words can be spoken of none other then *Jesus Christ*. He therefore it must be, who was thus described by the Apostle: *Who is the image of the Col. I. 15. invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For by 16, 17. him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* In which words our Saviour is expressly stiled the first-born of every Creature,

* In relation to
the precedent
words ὅτι ὁ
τῆς ἀρχῆς
αὐτοῦ, for that
ὁὗτος ἀρχὴς
was the ὁὗτος
ἀρχὴς τῶν
πάντων.

ture, that is, begotten by God, as the * *Son of his love*, antecedently to all other emanations, before any thing proceeded from him, or was framed and created by him. And that precedency is presently proved by this undeniable Argument, that all other emanations or productions came from him, and whatsoever received its being by creation, was by him created. Which assertion is delivered in the most proper, full, and pregnant expressions imaginable. First, in the vulgar phrase of *Moses*, as most consonant to his description; *for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth*; signifying thereby, that he speaketh of the same creation. Secondly, by a division which *Moses* never used, as describing the production onely of corporeall substances: lest therefore those immateriall beings might seem exempted from the Son's creation, becaule omitted in *Moses* his description, he addeth *visible and invisible*; and left in that invisible world, among the many degrees of the celestiall Hierarchy, any Order might seem exempted from an essentiall dependance upon him, he nameth those which are of greatest eminence, *whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers*, and under them comprehendeth all the rest. Nor doth it yet suffice, thus to extend the object of his power, by asserting all things to be made by him; except it be so understood, as to acknowledge the sovereignty of his Person, and the authority of his Action. For lest we should conceive the Son of God framing the world as a mere instrumentall cause which worketh by and for another, he sheweth him as well the finall as the efficient cause; *for all things were created by him, and for him*. Lastly, whereas all things first receive their being by creation, and when they have received it, continue in the same by vertue of Gods conservation, *in whom we live, and move, and have our being*; lest in any thing we should be thought not to depend immediately upon the Son of God, he is described as the

Conserver, as well as the Creatour; for *he is before all things, and by him all things consist*. If then we consider the two last cited verses by themselves, we cannot deny but they are a most complete description of the Creatour of the world; and if they were spoken of God the Father, could be no way injurious to his Majesty, who is no where more plainly or fully set forth unto us as the Maker of the world.

Now although this were sufficient to perswade us to interpret this place of the making of the world; yet it will not be unfit to make use of another reason, which will compell us so to understand it. For undoubtedly there are but two kinds of Creation in the language of the Scriptures, the one literall, the other metaphoricall; one old, the other new; one by way of formation, the other by way of reformation. *If any man be in Christ, he is* ^{2 Cor. 5. 17.} *a new creature*, saith S. Paul. and again, *In Christ Jesu neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor in-* ^{Gal. 6. 15.} *circumcision, but a new creature*. Instead of which words he had before, *faith working by love*. For we are ^{5. 6.} *the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesu unto* ^{Eph. 2. 10.} *good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them*. From whence it is evident that a new creature is such a person as truly believeth in Christ, and manifesteth that faith by the exercise of good works; and the new creation, is the reforming or bringing man into this new condition, which by nature or his first creation he was not in. And therefore he which is so created is called a new man, in opposition to the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitfull lusts: From whence the Apostle ^{Eph. 4. 22,} *chargeth us to be renewed in the spirit of our minds, and* ^{23, 24.} *to put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness, and true holiness; and which is re-* ^{Colos. 3. 10.} *newed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him*. The new creation then is described to us as con-

* ἀνανέωσις
 ἢ ἀνακαίνωσις.
 Cēs, as the
 new man νέος
 ἄνθρωπος, ἢ
 καινός ἄνθρω-
 πος. The first
 ὁ ἀνανεύμε-
 νος, the last ὁ
 ἀνακαίνυμε-
 νος, both the
 same. Suidas,
 Ἀνακαίνισις,
 ἢ ἀνανέωσις
 λέγεται διὰ τὴν
 ἀνακαίνωσις.
 which is the
 language of the
 New Testa-
 ment. This re-
 novation being
 thus called
 καινὴ κτίσις,
 the Ancients
 framed a
 proper word
 for it, which is,
 ἀνάνκτισις.
 ἐν ᾗ γίνεται
 πάντων ἡ ἐν
 ἄνθρωποις
 κατὰ τὴν ψυ-
 χὴν καὶ κατὰ
 τὸ σῶμα κα-
 κῶν ἀναίρεσις.
 Justin. Qu. &
 Resp. ad Græ-
 cos. This new
 creation doth so
 necessarily in-
 ferre an altera-
 tion, that it is called by S. Paul a Μεταμορφωσις; μεταμορφῶδε τῇ ἀνακαίνω-
 τὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν. Rom. 12. 2.

sisting wholly in * renovation, or a translation from a worse unto a better condition by way of reformation; by which those which have lost the image of God, in which the first man was created, are restored to the image of the same God again, by a reall change, though not substantiall, wrought within them. Now this being the notion of the new creation in all those places which undoubtedly and confessedly speak of it, it will be necessary to apply it unto such Scriptures as are pretended to require the same interpretation. Thus therefore I proceed. If the second or new creation cannot be meant by the Apostle in the place produced out of the Epistle to the Colossians, then it must be interpreted of the first. For there are but two kinds of Creation mentioned in the Scriptures, and one of them is there expressly named. But the place of the Apostle can no way admit an interpretation by the new Creation, as will thus appear: The object of the Creation mentioned in this place is of as great latitude and universality, as the object of the first creation, not onely expressed, but implied by Moses. But the object of the new creation is not of the same latitude with that of the old. Therefore that which is mentioned here cannot be the new creation. For certainly if we reflect upon the true notion of the new Creation, it necessarily and essentially includes an opposition to a former worse condition, as the new man is alwayes opposed to the old; and if Adam had continued still in innocency, there could have been no such distinction between the old man and the new, or the old and new creation. Being then all men become not new, being there is no new creature but such whose faith worketh by love, being so many millions of men have neither faith nor love; it cannot be said that by Christ all things were created anew that are in heaven

and that are in earth, when the greatest part of mankind have no share in the new creation. Again, we cannot imagine that the Apostle should speak of the Creation in a generall word, intending thereby onely the new, and while he doth so, expresse particularly and especially those parts of the old creation which are incapable of the new, or at least have no relation to it. The Angels are all either good or bad: but whether they be bad, they can never be good again, nor did *Christ* come to redeem the Devils; or whether they be good, they were alwayes such, nor were they so by the vertue of *Christs* incarnation, for *he took not on him the nature of Angels*. We acknowledge in mankind a new creation, because an old man becomes a new; but there is no such notion in the celestiall Hierarchy, because no old and new Angels: they which fell, are fallen for eternity; they which stand, alwayes stood, and shall stand for ever. Where then are the regenerated *thrones and dominions*? where are the re-created *principalities and powers*? All those Angels, of whatsoever degrees, were created by the Son of God, as the Apostle expressly affirms. But they were never created by a new creation *unto true holinesse and righteousness*, because they alwayes were truly righteous and holy, ever since their first creation. Therefore except we could yet invent another creation, which were neither the old nor the new, we must conclude, that all the Angels were at first created by the Son of God; and as they, so all things else.

Nor need we doubt of this interpretation, or the Doctrine arising from it, seeing it is so clearly delivered by *S. John*. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Whereas we have proved *Christ* had a being before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, because he was at
the

the beginning of the world; and have also proved that he was at the beginning of the world, because he made it; this place of S. *John* gives a sufficient testimony to the truth of both the last together. *In the beginning was the Word*; and that Word made flesh is *Christ*: therefore *Christ* was in the beginning. *All things were made by him*; therefore he created the world. Indeed nothing can be more clearly penn'd to give full satisfaction in this point, then these words of S. *John*, which seem with a strange brevity design'd to take off all objections, and remove all prejudice, before they teach so strange a truth. *Christ* was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and his age was known to them for whom this Gospel was penned. S. *John* would teach, that this *Christ* did make the world, which was created four thousand yeares before his birth. The name of *Iesus* was given him since at his circumcision: the title of *Christ* belonged unto his Office, which he exercised not till thirty yeares after. Neither of these with any shew of probability will reach to the Creation of the world. Wherefore he produceth a name of his, as yet unknown unto the world, or rather not taken notice of, though in frequent use among the *Jewes*, which belonged unto him who was made man, but before he was so. Under this name he shewes at first that he had a being in the beginning; when all things were to be created, and consequently were not yet, then, in the beginning was the Word, and so not created. This is the first step, the Word was not created when the world was made. The next is, that the same Word which then was, and was not made, at the same time ** was with God*, when he made all

† ἐν ἀρχῇ, the
first word of
Moses; whence
the Syriac
Translation,
ܠܠܚܝܬ.
So Solomon,

ܠܠܚܝܬ-ܡܝܬܪܐ
ܠܠܚܝܬ-ܡܝܬܪܐ

ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸ γῆν ποιῆσαι. Prov. 8. 22. * πρὸς τὸν θεόν, that is πρὸς τὸ θεόν, that is, by God. As Nonnus, Παλὰς ἔην ἀμέλειος, ἀτέρμονι Σωδρονος ἰδρύ. As *Wisdom* speaketh Prov. 8. 30. then I was by him. ܠܠܚܝܬ ܡܝܬܪܐ. ἡμιν παρ' αὐτοῦ. Chald. ܠܠܚܝܬ ܡܝܬܪܐ. et eram in latere ejus. Moschopolus μετ' ἑδω. πρὸς τὸν θεόν, τυτέσι μετὰ τῷ θεῷ. As Mat. 13. 16. αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ἔχουσιν παρὰ ἡμῶς οἶον; Mar. 14. 49. καθ' ἡμέραν ἡμιν πρὸς ὑμῶς. 1. Cor. 16. 6. πρὸς ὑμῶς ὅτι things:

things: and therefore well may we conceive 'twas he, to whom God said, *Let us make man in our image, after our likenesse*; and of whom those words may be understood, *Behold the man is become as one of us*. After this, Gen. 1. 26. Gen. 3. 22.

lest any should conceive the creation of the world too great and divine a work, to be attributed to the Word; lest any should object, that none can produce any thing out of nothing, but God himself; he addeth, that the *Word*, as he *was with God*, so *was he also God*. Again, lest any should divide the Deity, or frame a false conception of different Gods, he returns unto the second assertion, and joynes it with the first; *The same was in the beginning with God*: and then delivers that which at the first seem'd strange, but now after those three propositions may easily be accepted; *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*. For now this is no new doctrine, but onely an interpretation of those Scriptures which told us, God made all things by his word before. For God said, *Let there be light*, Gen. 1. 3. and *there was light*. And so *By the word of the Lord* Psal 33. 6. *were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth*. From whence we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God. Neither Heb. 11. 3. 2 Pet. 3. 5.

was it a new interpretation, but that which was most familiar to the *Jews*, who in their Synagogues, by the reading of the *Paraphrase* or *Interpretation* of the Hebrew text in the Chaldee language, were constantly taught, that the *Word of God* was the same with God, and that by that *Word* all things were made. Which undoubtedly was the cause why *S. John* delivered so great a mystery in so few words, as speaking unto them who at the first apprehension understood him. Onely that which † I conceive this Chaldee Paraphrase to represent the sense of the Jews of that age, as being their publick interpretation of the Scripture. wherefore what we find common and frequent in it, we cannot but think the vulgar and generall opinion of that Nation. Now it is certain that this Paraphrase doth often use *דבר אלהים* the *Word of God*, for *אלהים* God himself, and that especially with relation to the creation of the world. As Isa. 45. 12.

אֲנִי עָשִׂיתִי אֶרֶץ וָאָדָם עָלֶיהָ בְּרֵאשִׁית
 upon it, saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, which the Chaldees translate אֲנִי
 בְּמִמְרִי עָבַדְתִּי אֶרֶץ I by my word made the earth, and created man upon it.
 In the same manner Jer. 27. 5. I made the earth and men, and beasts on the face of
 the earth. the Targum אֲנִי עָבַדְתִּי אֶרֶץ And Is. 48. 13. אֲנִי
 בְּמִמְרִי עָבַדְתִּי אֶרֶץ. My hand also founded the earth. the Chaldees בְּמִמְרִי
 אֲנִי עָבַדְתִּי אֶרֶץ Eriam in verbo meo fundavi terram. And most clearly Gen.
 1. 27. we read, & creavit Deus hominem. the Jerusalem Targum, Verbum Do-
 mini creavit hominem. And Gen. 3. 8. Audierunt vocem Domini Dei. the Chal-
 dee Paraphrase וְשָׁמְעוּ יְהוָה קוֹל מִמְרָא דְּיָהּ & audierunt vocem verbi Domini
 Dei. Now this which the Chaldees Paraphrast called מִמְרָא, the Hellenists named
 Λόγος: as appeareth by Philo the Jew, who wrote before S. John, and reckons in
 his Divinity, first πατὴρ θεῶν ὁ λῶν, then δευτερεῖον θεῶν. ὁς ἔστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος.
 Quasi. & Solut. Whom he calls δευτερεῖον θεῶν Λόγον, δευτερεῖον ἵδον. De Agricult.
 He attributes the Creation of the world to this Λόγος, whom he termes δευτερεῖον
 θεῶν δι' ὃ (ὁ κόσμος) κατασκευάσας. De Flammeo gladio. Σὺ δὲ δὲ θεῶν ὁ Λό-
 γος αὐτῷ ἔδωκε, ὃ καὶ δὲ δευτερεῖον ὁρῶντος ἀποστολῆς ἐκκοσμοποιεῖς. Idem Allegor.
 l. 2. where we must observe, though Philo makes the Λόγος of whom he speaks, as
 instrumentall in the Creation of the world; yet he taketh it not for a bare expression of
 the will of God, but for a God, though in the second degree, and expressly for the Son of
 God. Nor ought we to look on Philo Judæus in this as a Platonist, but merely as a Jew,
 who referres his whole doctrine of this Λόγος to the first chapter of Genesis. And
 the rest of the Jewes before him, who had no such knowledge out of Plato's School,
 used the same notion. For as Jerem. 48. 13. the hand of God, is by the Chaldees Pa-
 raphrast translated, the Word of God: So in the book of Wisdom, ὁ παρὰ τοῦ ὁμοίου
 ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐγενήθη. Sap. 11. 17. is changed into ὁ παρὰ τοῦ ὁμοίου
 ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐγενήθη. 18. 15. & Siracides 43. 31. Ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ
 πάντα. Nay the Septuagint hath changed Shaddai, the undoubted name of the
 omnipotent God, into Λόγος the Word. Ezek. 1. 24. כְּקוֹל-שִׁיר. quasi vox subli-
 mis Dei, quod Hebraice appellatur שִׁיר, & juxta LXX. Φωνὴ τοῦ Λόγου, id est,
 vox verbi, ut universa quæ prædicantur in mundo, vocem Filii Dei esse dicamus. S.
 Hieron. If then all the Jewes, both they which understood the Chaldees exposition,
 and those which onely used the Greek Translation, had such a Notion of the Word
 of God; if all things by their confession were made by the Word; we have no reason
 to believe S. John should make use of any other Notion, then what they before had,
 and that by means whereof he might be so easily understood.

as yet they knew not, was, that this Word was made
 flesh, and that this Word made flesh was *Jesus Christ*.
 Wherefore this exposition being so literally clear in it self,
 so consonant to the Notion of the Word, and the appre-
 hension of the *Jewes*; it is infinitely to be preferred be-
 fore any such interpretation, as shall restrain the most uni-
 versals

versals to a few particulars, change the plainest expressions into figurative phrases, and make of a sublime truth, a weak, uselesse, false discourse. For who will grant that *in the beginning*, must be the same with that in S. John's Epistle, *from the beginning*? especially when the very interpretation involves in it self a contradiction. For the beginning in S. John's Epistle is that, in which the Apostles saw, and heard, and touch'd the Word: the beginning in his Gospel was that, in which *the Word was with God*, that is, not seen, nor heard by the Apostles, but known as yet to God alone, as the new exposition will have it. Who will conceive it worthy of the Apostles assertion, to teach that the Word had a being in the beginning of the Gospel, at what time John the Baptist began to preach, when we know the Baptist taught as much; who therefore *came baptizing with water, that he might be made manifest unto Israel*? when we are sure that S. Matthew and S. Luke, who wrote before him, taught us more then this; that he had a being thirty yeares before? when we are assured, it was as true of any other then living, as of the Word, even of Judas who betrayed him, even of Pilate who condemned him? Again, who can imagine the Apostle should assert, that the Word was, that is, had an actuall being, when as yet he was not actually the Word? For if the beginning be when John the Baptist began to preach, and the Word, as they say, be nothing else but he which speaketh, and so revealeth the will of God; Christ had not then revealed the will of God, and consequently was not then actually the Word, but onely potentially or by designation. Secondly, 'tis a strange figurative speech, the *Word was with God*, that is, was known to God, especially in this Apostles method. *In the beginning was the Word*; there was must signifie an actuall existence: and if so, why in the next sentence, *the Word was with God*, shall the same verb signifie an objective being onely? Certainly though to be

in the beginning, be one thing, and to be with God, another; yet *to be*, in either of them is the same. But if we should imagine this being understood of the knowledge of God, why we should grant that thereby is signified, he was known to God alone, I cannot conceive. For the proposition of it self is plainly affirmative, and the exclusive particle *onely* added to the exposition maketh it clearly negative. Nay more, the affirmative sense is certainly true, the negative as certainly false. For except *Gabriel* be God, who came to the Virgin, except every one of the heavenly host which appeared to the shepherds, be God, except *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, except *Simeon* and *Anna*, except *Joseph* and *Mary* be God; it cannot be true, that he was known to God onely, for to all these he was certainly known. Thirdly, to passe by the third attribute, *and the word was God*, as having occasion suddenly after to handle it; seeing the Apostle hath again repeated the circumstance of time as most materiall, *the same was in the beginning with God*, and immediately subjoynd those words, *all things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made*; how can we receive any exposition which referreth not the making of all these things to him in the beginning? But if we understand the later part, of the Apostles, who after the Ascension of our Saviour, did nothing but what they were commanded and impowered to do by *Christ*, it will bear no relation to the beginning. If we interpret the former, of all which *Jesus* said and did in the promulgation of the Gospel, we cannot yet reach to the beginning assigned by the new Expositours: for while *John* the Baptist onely preached, while in their sense the Word was with God, they will not affirm that *Jesus* did any of these things that here are spoken of. And consequently, according to their grounds, it will be true to say, In the beginning was the Word, and that Word in the beginning was with God, insomuch as in the beginning nothing was done by him,

but

but without him were all things done, which were done in the beginning. Wherefore in all reason we should stick to the known interpretation, in which every word receiveth its own proper signification, without any figurative distortion, and is preserved in its due latitude and extension without any curtailing restriction. And therefore I conclude from the undeniable testimony of *S. John*, that in the beginning, when the heavens and the earth and all the hosts of them were created, all things were made by the Word, who is Christ Jesus being made flesh; and consequently by the method of Argument, as the Apostle antecedently by the method of Nature, that in the beginning *Christ* was. He then who was in heaven and descended from thence, before that which was begotten of the Virgin ascended thither; he who was before *John* the Baptist, and before *Abraham*; he who was at the end of the first world, and at the beginning of the same; he had a reall being and existence before *Christ* was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*. But all these we have already shewed belong unto the Son of God. Therefore we must acknowledge, that *Jesus Christ* had a reall being and existence, before he was begotten by the Holy Ghost: Which is our first Assertion, properly opposed to the * *Photinians*.

* The Photinians were Heretics, so cal-

led from Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, but born in Gallogræcia, and scholar to Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra. Photinus de Gallogræcia, Marcelli discipulus, Sirmii Episcopus ordinatus, Hebionis Hæresin instaurare conatus est. S. Hieron. Catal. Eccl. Photinus Sirmiensis Episcopus fuit à Marcello imbutus. Nam & Diaconus sub eo aliquandiu fuit. Hilar. Fragm. Wherefore when Epiphanius speaketh thus of him, Ἦτος ὡρμαῖο ἀπὸ Σιρμίου, it hath no relation to the originall of his person, but his Heresy; of which S. Hilary, Pestifere natum Iesum Christum ex Maria, Pannonia defendit. De Trin. He was a man of singular parts and abilities, Φύσις ἔχων ἑυλόγειν, καὶ πείθειν ἱκανός, says Sozom. l. 4. c. 6. Τέχνη δὲ Ἦτος ὁ Φωτεινὸς λόγος τὸν τρόπον, καὶ ὡξυμένους τὴν γλῶσσαν, πολλὰς δὲ διδάμνους ἀπατᾷν τῇ τῷ λόγῳ πεφορεῖ καὶ ἐτοιμολογία. Epiphani. Hær. 71. Erat & ingenii viribus valens, & doctrinæ opibus excellens, & eloquio præpotens, quippe qui utroque sermone copiose & graviter disputaret & scriberet. Vincent.

Lirin. c. 16. He is said by some to follow the Heresy of Ebion. *Hebionis* Hæresin instaurare conatus est, says *S. Hierome.* and *S. Hilary* ordinarily understands him by the name of *Hebion*, and sometimes expounds himself, *Hebion, qui est Photinus.* But there is no similitude in their doctrines. *Hebion* being more Jew than Christian, and teaching Christ as much begotten by Joseph, as born of Mary. *Philaster* will have him agree wholly with *Paulus Samosatenus* in omnibus. *Epiphanius* with an ἀπὸ μητρὸς, and ἐκ πατρὸς. *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, with him and with *Sabellius*: whereas he differ'd much from them both, especially from *Sabellius*, as being farre from a *Patripassian*. *Marcellus Sabellianæ* hæresis assertor excitat: *Photinus* vero novam hæresin jam ante protulerat, à *Sabellio* quidem in unione dissentiens, sed initium Christi ex *Maria* prædicabat. *Severus Hist. Sac.* wherefore it will not be unnecessary to collect out of *Antiquity* what did properly belong unto *Photinus*, because I think it not yet done, and we find it to begin and spread again. *Photinus* mentis cæcitate deceptus, in Christo verum, & substantiæ nostræ confessus est hominem, sed eundem Deum de Deo ante omnia sæcula genitum esse non credidit. *Leo de Nativ. Christi, Sermon. 4.* Ecce *Photinus* hominem tantum proficitur Dei Filium, dicit illum non fuisse ante beatam Mariam. *Lucifer Clarit.* Si quis in Christo sic veritatem prædicat animæ & carnis, ut veritatem in eo nolit accipere Deitatis, id est, qui sic dicit Christum hominem, ut Deum neger, non est Christianus Catholicus, sed *Photinianus* Hæreticus. *Fulg. ad Donat. l. 16.* Φωτίνος· ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγει τὸν γεννημένον, Θεὸν μὴ λέγων εἶναι τὸν τέκνον, καὶ τὸν ἐκ μητρὸς προελθόντα ἄνθρωπον ὑποτίθει διηρημένον θεῷ. *Theodot. Homil. de Nativ. Ephes. Concil. p. 3. c. 10.* Anathematizamus *Photinum*, qui *Hebionis* Hæresim instaurans, Dominum Jesum Christum tantum ex *Maria* Virgine confitetur. *Damasus Profess. Fidei.* Φάσκει δὲ ἕτος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Χριστὸν μὴ εἶναι, ἀπὸ δὲ Μαρίας καὶ δευτέρου αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν, ἐξ ὅτου, φησὶ, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπιλάθην ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐγεννήθη ἐκ Πνεύματος καὶ ἁγίου. *Epiphanius.* Ἐλεγε δὲ ὡς θεὸς μὲν ὅτι παροικράτωρ εἰς ὃ εἶδ' ὁ λόγος τὰ πάντα δημιουργήσας· τὴν δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν αἰώνων γεννησὶν τε καὶ ὑπαρξὶν τῷ υἱῷ ἐκ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ Μαρίας γεννᾷ τὸν Χριστὸν εἰσληγῆτο. *Sozomen l. 4. c. 6.* *Photini* ergo secta hæc est. Dicit Deum singulum esse & solitarium, & more Judæico confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat, neque ullam Dei Verbi, aut ullam Spiritus Sancti putat esse personam. Christum vero hominem tantummodo solitarium asserit, cui principium adscribit ex *Maria*; & hoc omnibus modis dogmatizat, solam nos personam Dei Patris, & solum Christum hominem colere debere. *Vinc. Lirinensis Adv. Hæres. c. 17.* In the Disputation framed by *Vigilius* out of the seventh book of *S. Hilary*, as I conceive, *Photinus* rejecting the opinion of *Sabellius*, (whom *Socrates* and *Sozomen* said he followed) as impious, thus declares his own. Unde magis ego dico, Deum Patrem Filium habere Dominum Jesum Christum, ex *Maria* Virgine initium sumentem, qui per sanctæ conversationis excellentissimum atque inimitabile beatitudinis meritum, à Deo Patre in Filium adoptatus, & eximio Divinitatis honore donatus, and again; Ego Domino nostro Jesu Christo initium tribuo, purumque hominem fuisse affirmo, & per beatæ vitæ excellentissimum meritum Divinitatis honorem fuisse adeptum. vide eundem lib. 2. Adv. *Eutychen.*

Ignorat

Ignorat etiam Fotinus magnum pietatis, quod Apostolus memorat, sacramentum, qui Christi ex Virgine fateretur exordium: Et propterea non credit sine initio substantialiter Deum natum ex Deo Patre, in quo carnis veritatem conficitur ex Virgine. Fulg. ad Thrasim. l. 1. Gregory Nazianzen, according to his custome, gives a very brief, but remarkable expression, *Θεογονὴ τὸν κατὰ Χριστὸν, καὶ ἀπὸ Μαρίας ἀρχόμενον*. Orat. 26. But the Opinion of Photinus cannot be better understood then by the Condemnation of it, in the Council of Sirmium; which having set out the Confession of their Faith in brief, addeth many and various Anathema's, according to the severall Heresies then apparent, without mentioning their names. Of these the fifth aimes clearly at Photinus. Si quis secundum præscientiam vel prædestinationem ex Maria dicit filium esse, & non ante sæcula ex Patre natum, apud Deum esse, & per eum facta esse omnia, Anathema sit. The 13. 14. and 15. also were particulars directed against him, as S. Hilary hath observed: but the last of all is most materiall. Si quis Christum Deum, Filium Dei, ante sæcula subsistentem, & ministrantem Patri ad omnium perfectionem non dicat, sed ex quo de Maria natus est, ex eo & Christum & Filium nominatum esse, & initium accepisse ut sit Deus, dicat, Anathema sit. Upon which the Observation of S. Hilary is this. Concludi damnatio ejus Hæresis, propter quam conventum erat, (that is the Photinian) expositione totius fidei cui adversabatur, oportuit, quæ initium Dei Filii ex partu Virginis mentiebatur. S. Hilar. de Synod. contra Arrianos. Thus was Photinus Bishop of Sirmium condemned by a Council held in the same City. They all agreed suddenly in the condemnation of him, Arrians. Semi-arrians and Catholicks; καὶ πάντες οὕτως says Socrates, καὶ τὸ μὲν ὡς καλῶς καὶ δικαίως γινόμενον, πάντες ἐπήνεσαν καὶ τότε καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα. l. 2. c. 29. And because his History is very obscure and intricate, take this brief Catalogue of his condemnations. We read that he was condemned at the Council of Nice, and at the same time by a Council at Rome under Sylvester: but this is deliver'd only in a forged Epilogue Concilii Romani. He was then first condemned with Marcellus his master, as Sulpitius Severus relates, probably by the Synod at Constantinople: for in that Marcellus was deprived. Sozom. l. 2. 33. Socrat. l. 1. 36. Secondly, his Heresy is renounced in the second Synod at Antioch. Athanas. de Syn. Socrat. l. 1. 19. Thirdly, he was condemned in the Council of Sardes. Epiphani. & Sulpitius Severus. Fourthly, by a Council at Milan. S. Hilar. Fragm. Fifthly, in a Synod at Sirmium he was deposed by the Western Bishops; but by reason of the great opinion and affection of the people he could not be removed. S. Hilar. Fragm. Sixthly, he was again condemned and deposed at Sirmium by the Eastern Bishops, and being convicted by Basil Bishop of Ancyra, was banished from thence. S. Hilar. Epiph. Socr. Sozom. Vigilius. Indeed he was so generally condemned not only then, but afterwards under Valentinian, as S. Hierome testifies, and the Synodic Epistle of the Aquileian Council, that his opinion was soon worn out of the world. *Ἦδὲ καὶ δισσεδέσθην εἰς ὁρίζον γέγονεν ἡ τύχη τοῦ ἡπατημένου αἵματος*, says Epiphanius, who lived not long after him. So suddenly was this opinion rejected by all Christians, applauded by none but Julian the Heretick, who railed at S. John for making Christ God, and commended Photinus for denying it; as appears by an Epistle written by Julian unto him, as it is (though a mean

translation) delivered by Facundus. Tu quidem, O phosine, verisimilis videris, & proxima salutare, bene faciens nequaquam in utero inducere, quem credidisti Deum. Facun. ad Justinian. l. 4.

Heb. 3. 4.

Prov. 8. 23.

† and that upon so poor a ground as the want of an Article, because in the first place it is ἡν

πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, in the second, Θεός ἡν ὁ λόγος, not ὁ Θεός. From hence to conclude, ὁ Θεός is one God, that is, κατ' ἑξοχὴν, the supreme God; Θεός another, not the supreme, but one made God by him. Indeed they are beholding to Epiphanius for this Observation, whose words are these, Ἐὰν εἰπωμεν Θεός, αὐτὸν οὐ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν

former

ἡμεῖς δὲν ἢ ἐθνῶν, ἢ θεῶν τὸν ὄντα, (or rather ἐκ ὄντα.) ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν
 ὁ θεός, δῆλον ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρθρε τὸν ὄντα. *Cy*μαίνομεν ἀληθῆ τε καὶ ἡνωσκόμενον
 Samarit. Hæres. But whosoever shall apply this rule to the sacred Scriptures, will
 find it most fallacious. In the beginning ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν
 γῆν, undoubtedly belongs to the true and supreme God: but it does not thence follow,
 that πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπιφέρειτο ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὕδατος, should be understood of the Spirit
 of another, or inferior God. Certainly S. John, when he speaks of the Baptist ἐγένετο
 ἀνδραπῶς ἀπεσταλμένον παρὰ θεοῦ, meant, he had his commission from heaven; and
 when it is spoken of Christ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, and again, ἐκ
 θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν, it must be understood of the true God the Father, in the like man-
 ner, θεῶν ὁδὸς ἐσέλασε πῶσιν, if it were taken τὸν ὄντα of any ever called God,
 nay even of Christ Jesus as man, it were certainly false. How can then any deny the
 Word to be the supreme God, because he is called simply θεός, when S. John in
 the four next places, in which he speaks of the supreme God, mentioneth him without
 an Article? This Criticism of theirs was first the observation of Alterius the
 Arian, Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ μαχθεῖς Φαῦλος Χριστὸν κηρύσσειν τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμιν,
 ἢ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις τῆς προδότης, δυνάμιν θεοῦ, καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν.
 ἀλλήν μὲν εἶναι τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμιν τὴν ἑμμεντον αὐτῷ καὶ ἑωυτοῦ
 ἀγγελλῶν, κηρύσσειν. These are the words of Alterius recorded by Athana-
 sius Orat. 2. contra Arianos. In which place notwithstanding, none can deny but
 θεοῦ is twice taken without an Article for the true and supreme God. Thus Didy-
 mus of Alexandria De Sp. S. would distinguish between the Person and the gift
 of the Holy Ghost by the addition or defect of the article. Apostoli quando intelli-
 gunt Personam Spiritus Sancti, addunt Articulum τὸ πνεῦμα, sine quo Spi-ritus
 Sancti dona notantur. And Athanasius objects against his adversaries denying the
 Holy Ghost to be God, that they produced places out of the Prophets to prove him a
 Creature, where πνεῦμα had not so much as an Article prefixed, which might give
 some colour to interpret it of the Holy Spirit. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ ἀρθεον ἔχει τὸ πα-
 ρὰ τοῦ προφήτου λεγόμενον νῦν πνεῦμα, ἵνα καὶ παρῶσιν ἔχη. Epist. ad Sera-
 pionem. whereas we find in the same place of S. John, the same Spirit in the same
 sense mentioned with and without an Article. ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἢ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ
 πνεύματος, Joh. 3. 5. and, τὸ γεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, v. 6. So 1 Joh.
 4. 1. μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πεσεύετε, ἀλλὰ δοκιμάζειτε τὰ πνεύματα. and again,
 ἐν ταῖς ἡνώσεσιν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ· πᾶν πνεῦμα, &c. And besides, according
 to that distinction, τὸ πνεῦμα certainly stands for the gift of the Spirit. 1 Thess.
 5. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ βέννυτε. In the like manner, it is so farre from truth that
 the Scriptures observe so much the Articles, as to use ὁ θεός alwayes for the true and
 supreme God, and θεός for the false or inferior; that where the true is professedly
 opposed to the false, even there he is stiled simply θεός. As, ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν ἐκ εἰδό-
 τας θεῶν, ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς μὴ φύσει ἔστι θεοῖς. Νῦν δὲ γινόντες θεῶν, μᾶλλον
 δὲ ἡνωθέντες ἑκὼν θεοῦ. Gal. 4. 8, 9. And where the supreme is distinguished
 from him whom they make the inferior God, he is called likewise θεός without an
 Article: as, δῆλος Ἰνσὺ Χριστῷ, ἀφωτισμένος ὡς ἐναγώνιος θεός. and, τὸν θε-
 ῶν ὁδὸς ἢ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει. Rom. 1. 1.

ματος θεῷ. 1 Cor. 1. 1. 2 Cor. 1. 1. Eph. 1. 1. Col. 1. 1. And if this distinction were good, our Saviours argument to the Pharisees were not so. Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐκ ἀνθρώπου, ὁ θεὸς ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαίμονια, ἀπὸ ὧν ἐσθλασὶν ἐπ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, Mat. 12. 28. For it doth not follow, that if by the power of an inferiour or false God he cast out devils, that therefore the Kingdome of the true and supreme God is come upon them.

Joh. 1. 4, 5.

former sentence, the first of that which followeth: As, *In him was life, and the life was the light of men, and the light shineth in darknesse, and the darknesse comprehended it not: so, In the beginning was the Word and the Word, which so was in the beginning, was with God; and the Word was God; that is, the same God with whom the Word was in the beginning. But he could not be the same God with him any other way, then by having the same divine essence. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was begotten of the Virgin, was the divine nature, by which he was properly and really God.*

Secondly, He who was subsisting in the form of God, and thought himself to be equall with God, (in which thought he could not be deceived, nor be injurious to God) must of necessity be truly and essentially God. Because there can be no equality between the divine essence, which is infinite, and any other whatsoever, which must be finite. But this is true of Christ, and that antecedently to his conception in the Virgins wombe, and existence in his humane nature. For, *being* (or rather † *subsisting*) *in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be equall with God: But emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Out of which words naturally result three propositions fully demonstrating our Assertion. First, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man. Secondly, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant. Thirdly, that he was as much in the form of God, that is, did as truly and really subsist in the divine nature, as in the form of a servant, or in the nature

Philip. 2. 6, 7.

† In effigie Dei consuetus.

Tertull. In figura Dei constitutus. Cyr.

nature of man. It is a vain imagination, that our Saviour then first appeared a servant, when he was apprehended, bound, scourged, crucified. For, they were not all slaves which ever suffer'd such indignities, or died that death; and when they did, their death did not make, but find them, or suppose them servants. Beside, our Saviour in all the degrees of his humiliation, never lived as a servant unto any Master on earth. 'Tis true, at first he was subject, but as a Son, to his reputed father and undoubted mother. when he appear'd in publick, he lived after the manner of a Prophet, and a Doctour sent from God, accompanied with a family, as 'twere, of his Apostles, whose Master he professed himself, subject to the commands of no man in that Office, and obedient only unto God. The *form* then of a servant which he took upon him, must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was, when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was *made flesh*, sent in the *likenesse of sinfull flesh*, subject unto all infirmities and miseries of this life attending on the sons of men fallen by the sins of *Adam*: in that he was *made of a woman, made under the law*, and so obliged to perform the same; which law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from servants: in that he was born, bred, and liv'd in a mean, low, and abject condition; as a root out of a drie ground, he had no form nor comeliness, and when they saw him, there was no beauty that they should desire him; but was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: In that he was thus made man, he took upon him the form of a servant. which is not mine, but the Apostles explication; as adding it not by way of conjunction, in which there might be some diversity, but by way of apposition, which signifieth a clear identity. And therefore it is necessary to observe, that our translation of that verse is not only not exact, but very disadvantageous to that truth

Rom. 8. 3.

Gal. 4. 4.

Isa 53. 2, 3.

* ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν
ἐκένωσεν, μορ-
φὴν δούλου λα-
βὼν, ὃν ὁμοι-
ώματι ἀνθρώ-
πων γενόμενος.
which is also
exactly obser-
ved by the Vul-
gar Latine,
Sed semetip-
sum exinaniv-
it, formam
servi accipiens,
in similitudine
hominum fa-
ctus. where
γενόμενος is
added by appo-
sition to λα-
βὼν, and have
both equall ve-
lution to ἐκέν-
ωσεν, or, which
is all one, ἐκέν-
ωσεν λαβὼν,
ἐλαβε γενό-
μενος.
a Phil. 2. 8.
† ἐταπείνω-
σεν ἐαυτὸν,
γενόμενος
ὑπὸ κρίσεως. For
in both these
verses there is
but one conjun-
ction, joining
together two acts of our Saviour, his first exinanition or ἐκένωσεν, and his farther
humiliation or ἐταπείνωσεν. the rest are all participles added for explication to the
verbs. b Psal. 40. 6. c Ex. 31. 6. Deut. 15. 17.

which is contained in it. For we read it thus; *He made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* where we have two copulative conjunctions, neither of which is in the * originall text, and three distinct propositions, without any dependence of one upon the other; whereas all the words together are but an expression of Christs exinanition, with an explication shewing in what it consisteth: which will clearly appear by this literall translation, *But emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.* Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied himself, the text will satisfie him, by taking the form of a servant; if any still question, how he took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostles resolution, by being made in the likeness of men. Indeed after the expression of this exinanition, he goes on with a conjunction, to adde another act of Christs humiliation; *a And being found in fashion as a man,* being already by his exinanition in the form of a servant, or the likeness of men, *he humbled himself, and became* (or rather, *† becoming*) *obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* As therefore his humiliation consisted in his obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man. All which is very fitly expressed by a strange interpretation on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. For whereas these words are clearly in the Psalmist, *b Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine eares hast thou opened:* the Apostle appropriateth the sentence to Christ; *When he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* Now being the *c* bearing of the ear under the law was a note of perpetuall servitude, being this was expressed in the words of the Psalmist,

Psalmist,

Psalmist, and changed by the Apostle into the preparing of a body; it followeth, that when Christs body first was fram'd, even then did he assume the form of a servant.

Again, it appeareth out of the same Text, that Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, and consequently before he was made man. For he which is presupposed to be, and to think of that being which he hath, and upon that thought to receive; must have that being before that assumption: but Christ is first expressly said to be in the form of God, and being so, to think it no robbery to be equall with God, and notwithstanding that equality, to take upon him the form of a servant: therefore it cannot be denied, but he was before in the form of God. Beside, he was not in the form of a servant but by the emptying of himself, and all exinanition necessarily presupposeth a precedent plenitude; it being as impossible to empty any thing which hath no fulnesse, as to fill any thing which hath no emptinesse. But the fulnesse which Christ had, in respect whereof assuming the form of a servant he is said to empty himself, could be in nothing else but in the form of God, in which he was before. Wherefore, if the assumption of the form of a servant be contemporary with his exinanition; if that exinanition necessarily presupposeth a plenitude as indispensably antecedent to it; if the form of God be also coevall with that precedent plenitude; then must we confesse, Christ was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant: which is the second Proposition.

Again, it is as evident from the same Scripture, that Christ was as much in the form of God, as the form of a servant; and did as really subsist in the divine nature, as in the nature of man. For he was so *in the form of God*, as thereby to be ** equall with God*. But no other

* τὸ εἶναι ἴσους
θεῷ. Pariari
Deo. Tertul.

Esse se æqualem Deo. Cyp. Esse æqualis Deo. Leporius. Thus all expresse the notion of equality, not of similitude: nor can we understand any lesse by τὸ εἶναι ἴσους, form

then τὴν ἰσότητά, ἴσων and ἴσα being indifferently used by the Greeks. as Pindarus Olym. Ode 2.

ἴσων δὲ νύκτεσσιν αἰεὶ,
ἴσα δ' ἐν αἰμέρεσσιν αἰεὶ -
ὄν ἔχοντες, ἀπονέεσθον
ἴσας δὲ νύκτον καὶ ἡμέραν.

So whom the Greeks call ἰσότητος, Homer ἴσα θεῶ. Odyss. O.

Τὸν νῦν ἴσα θεῶ Ἰθακῆςιοι εἰσέβωσι.

where ἴσα has not the nature of an adverb, as belonging to εἰσέβωσι, but of a Noun referred to the antecedent Τὸν, or including an adverb added to a noun, τὸν νῦν ὡς ἰσότητος. The collection of Grotius from this verse is very strange, εἶναι ἴσα θεῶ, est spectari tanquam Deum. As if he should have said, εἰσέβωσι signifies spectant, therefore εἶναι signifies spectari. This he was forced to put off thus; because the strength of our interpretation, rendring an equality, lies in the verb substantive τὸ εἶναι. For we acknowledge that ἴσα by it self oft-times significeth no more then inltar, and so inferreth nothing but a similitudo: as we find it frequently in the book of Job. where it sometimes answereth to the inseparable particle כ, as כְּלִילָה, quali in nocte, ἴσα νυκτί. 5. 14. כְּבֹרֶה, sicut calceum, ἴσα περὶ. 10. 10. כְּרֶקֶב, quasi putredo, Sym. ὁμοίως ὡς περὶ, LXX ἴσα ἀσκή, 13. 28. כְּמִים, sicut aquam, ἴσα ποτῶ. 15. 16. כֵּץ, tanquam lignum, ἴσα ξύλῳ. 24. 20. כְּחֶמֶר, sicut lutum, ἴσα πηλῶ. 27. 16. כְּמַעֲלָה, sicut vestimento, ἴσα διπλοῖσθαι. 29. 14. כְּבֹקֶר, quasi bos, ἴσα βουί. 40. 10. Where we see the vulgar Latine useth for the Hebrew כ quasi, sicut, tanquam, the LXX ἴσα. Sometime it answereth to no word in the Originall, but supplieth a similitudo understood, not expressed in the Hebrew: as קַוָּי, tanquam pullum, ἴσα ὄνῳ. 11. 12. וְאֶבֶן, & lapis, ἴσα λίθῳ. 18. 2. חֶמֶר, luto, ἴσα πηλῶ. 30. 19. Once it rendreth an Hebrew word, rather according to the intention, then the signification; כְּמַלְיֵי אֶפֶר, comparabitur cineri. Ad verbum, proverbial cineris, ἴσα πηλῶ. 13. 12. So that in all the'e places it is used adverbially for inltar, and in none hath the addition of τὸ εἶναι to it.

Isa. 40. 25.
46. 5.

form beside the essentiall, which is the divine nature it self, could inferre an equality with God. To whom will ye liken me, and make me equall? saith the Holy one. There can be but one infinite, eternall and independent being; and there can be no comparison between that, and whatsoever is finite, temporall, and depending. He therefore who did truly think himself equall with God, as being in the form of God, must be conceived to subsist in that one infinite, eternall, and independent nature of God. Again, the phrase, in the form of God, not elsewhere mention'd, is used by the Apostle with a respect un-

to that other, of the *form of a servant*, exegetically continued in the *likenesse of man*; and the respect of one unto the other is so necessary, that if the form of God be not as reall and essentiall as the form of a servant, or the likenesse of man, there is no force in the Apostle's words, nor will his argument be fit to work any great degree of humiliation upon the consideration of Christs exinanition. But by the *form*, is certainly understood the true condition of a servant, and by the *likenesse*, infallibly meant the reall nature of man: nor doth the *fashion* in which he was found, destroy, but rather assert the truth of his humanity. And therefore, as sure as Christ was really and essentially man, of the same nature with us, in whose similitude he was made; so certainly was he also really and essentially God, of the same nature and being with him, in whole form he did subsist. Seeing then we have clearly evinced from the expresse words of *S. Paul*, that Christ was in the form of a servant as soon as he was made man, that he was in the form of God before he was in the form of a servant, that the form of God in which he subsisted doth as truly signifie the divine, as the likenesse of man, the humane nature; it necessarily followeth, that Christ had a reall existence before he was begotten of the Virgin, and that the being which he had, was the divine essence, by which he was truly, really, and properly God.

Thirdly, He which is expressly tiled Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, without any restriction or limitation; as he is after, so was before any time assigneable, truly and essentially God. For by this title God describeth his own being, and distinguisheth it from all other.

I the Lord, the first, and with the last, I am he. I am he, Isa. 41, 4.

I am the first, I also am the last. I am the first, and I 48, 12.

am the last, and beside me there is no God. But Christ is 44, 6.

expressly called Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.

He so proclaimed himself, by a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the* Rev. 1, 11.

last.

Isa. 48. 12.

Rev. I. 17.

13.

2. 8.

Rev. 21. 13.

* with the Article, so much
elsewhere stood
upon, τὸ α καὶ
τὸ ω, ὁ αὐτὸς
καὶ ὁ ὅλος. The Alpha and
the Omega, the
first and the
last. For we
must not take
τὸ α as the
Grammarians
do, by which
they signify on-
ly the letter
written in that
figure, and

called by that name. As appeareth by Eratosthenes, who was called Βῆτα, κατὰ ῥήματα, as Suidas corruptly. Hesychius Illustrius, from whom Suidas had that passage; Ἐρατοσθένης διὰ τὸ δευτερεῖον παντὶ ἐνδεῖ παρ' ὧν τοῖς ἀπὸ ἐγγίζων Βῆτα ἐκλήθη. And Martianus Heracleota in Periplo, καὶ μετ' ἐκείνου Ἐρατοσθένης διὰ τὸ Βῆτα ἐκλήθη. Ἐρατοσθένης ὁ ἀπὸ Περσέως. a Rev. 3. 8.

is the supreme eternall God, of the same divine essence with the Father, who was before described by *him which is, and which was, and which is to come*; to whom the six wing'd beasts continually cry, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*; as the familiar explication of that name which God revealed to *Moses*. If they belong unto the supreme God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; then did he so describe himself unto *S. John*, and expresse his supreme Deity, that by those words, *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending*, he might be known to be the one almighty and eternall God: and consequently, whosoever should assume that title, must attribute as much unto himself. Wherefore being Christ hath so immediately, and with so great solemnity and frequency, taken the same stile upon him, by which the Father did expresse his Godhead; it followeth, that he hath declar'd himself to be the supreme, almighty, and eternall God. And being thus the Alpha and the First, he was before any time assignable, and consequently before he was conceived of the Virgin; and the being which then he had was the divine essence, by which he was truly and properly the almighty and eternall God.

4.

Rev. 4. 8.

Exod. 3. 14.

Fourthly, He whose glory *Isaiah* saw in the year that King *Uzziah* died, had a being before Christ was begotten of the Virgin, and that being was the divine essence, by which he was naturally and essentially God. For he is expressly call'd *the Lord, Holy holy, holy, the Lord of hosts, whose glory filleth the whole earth*; which titles can belong to none beside the one and onely God. But Christ was he whose glory *Isaiah* saw, as *S. John* doth testifie, saying, *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory*, *Jo. 12. 41.* and spake of him. and he whose glory he saw, and of whom he spake, was certainly Christ: for of him the Apostle treateth in that place, and of none but him. *These things spake Jesus and departed.* But *thou* (that

36.

37.

38.

39.

40.

41.

is, Jesus) had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that is, Christ, who wrought those miracles. The reason why they believed not on him; that the saying of Esaias the Prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? And as they did not, so they could not believe in Christ, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them. For those who God foresaw, and the Prophet foretold, should not believe, could not do it without contradicting the prescience of the one, and the predictions of the other. But the *Jewes* refusing to assent unto the doctrine of our Saviour, were those of whom the Prophet spake. For these things said Esaias when he saw his glory, and spake of him. Now if the glory which Isaias saw were the glory of Christ, and he of whom Isaias in that chapter spake were Christ himself; then must those blinded eyes and hardened hearts belong unto these *Jewes*, and then their infidelity was so long since foretold. Thus doth the fixing of that Prophecy upon that people which saw our Saviour's miracles, depend upon Isaias's vision, and the appropriation of it unto Christ. Wherefore S. *John* infallibly hath taught us, that the Prophet saw the glory of Christ; and the Prophet hath as undoubtedly assured us, that he, whose glory then he saw, was the one omnipotent and eternall God; and consequently both together have seal'd this truth, that Christ did then subsist in that glorious majesty of the eternall Godhead.

Lastly, He who being man, is frequently in the Scriptures called God, and that in such a manner, as by that name no other can be understood but the one onely and eternall God, he had an existence before he was made man, and the being which then he had was no other then the eternall Deity. Because all novelty is repugnant to the

Deity,

Deity, nor can any be that one God, who was not so from all eternity. But Jesus Christ, being in the nature of man, is frequently in the sacred Scriptures called God; and that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternall God. Which may be thus demonstrated. It hath been already prov'd, and we all agree in this, that there can be but one divine essence, and so but one supreme God. Wherefore were it not said in the Scriptures, there are many Gods; did not he himself who is supreme call others so; we durst not give that name to any but to him alone, nor could we think any called God to be any other but that one. It had been then enough to have alledg'd that Christ is God, to prove his supreme and eternall Deity: whereas now we are answered, that there are Gods many, and therefore it followeth not from that name, that he is the one eternall God. But if Christ be none of those many Gods, and yet be God, then can he be no other but that one. And that he is not to be numbred with them, is certain, because he is clearly distinguished from them, and opposed to them. We read in the Psalmist, *I have said ye are Gods, and all of you are children of the most* Ps. 82. 6. *Hgh.* But we must not reckon Christ among those Gods, we must not number the onely-begotten Son among those children. For *they knew not, neither would they understand, they walked on in darknesse*: and who so ever were Gods onely as they were, either did or might do so. Whereas Christ, *in whom alone dwelt all the ful- col. 1. 9.* *ness of the Godhead bodily*, is not onely distinguished from, but opposed to such Gods as those, by his disciples saying, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things*; by himself *Joh. 16. 30.* *proclaiming, I am the light of the world, he that fol- Joh. 1. 12.* *loweth me shall not walk in darknesse*. S. Paul hath told us *there be gods many, and lords many*; but withall hath *1 Cor. 8. 5.* *taught us, that to us there is but one God, the Father, and* 6. *one Lord Jesus Christ*. In which words as the *Father* is

oppos'd as much unto the *many Lords*, as *many Gods*; so is the Son as much unto the *many Gods*, as *many Lords*; the Father being as much Lord as God, and the Son as much God as Lord. Wherefore being we find in Scripture frequent mention of one God, and beside that one an intimation of many Gods, and whosoever is called God must either be that one, or one of those many; being we find our blessed Saviour to be wholly oppos'd to the many Gods, and consequently to be none of them, and yet we read him often stiled God: it followeth, that that name is attributed unto him in such a manner, as by it no other can be understood but the one Almighty and Eternall God.

Again, those who deny our Saviour to be the same God with the Father, have invented rules to be the touchstone of the eternall power and Godhead. First, where the name of God is taken absolutely, as the subject of any proposition, it alwayes signifieth the supreme power and Majesty, excluding all others from that Deity. Secondly, where the same name is any way used with an article by way of excellency, it likewise signifieth the same supreme Godhead, as admitting others to a communion of Deity, but excluding them from the supremacy. Upon these two rules they have rais'd unto themselves this Observation, that whensoever the name of God absolutely taken is plac'd as the subject of any proposition, it is not to be understood of Christ: and wheresoever the same name is spoken of our Saviour by way of predicate, it never hath an Article denoting excellency annexed to it; and consequently leaves him in the number of those Gods who are excluded from the Majesty of the eternall Deity.

Now though there can be no kind of certainty in any such observations of the Articles, because the Greeks promiscuously often use them, or omit them, without any reason of their usurpation or omission (whereof examples are innumerable;) though, if those rules were granted, yet
would

would not their Conclusion follow, because the supreme God is often named (as they confesse) without an Article, and therefore the same name may signifie the same God, when spoken of Christ, as well as when of the Father, so farre as can concern the omission of the Article : Yet, to complete my demonstration, I shall shew first, that the name of God taken subjectively is to be understood of Christ. Secondly, that the same name with the Article affixed is attributed unto him. Thirdly, that if it were not so, yet where the Article is wanting, there is that added to the predicate, which hath as great a virtue to signifie that excellency, as the Article could have.

S. Paul unfolding the mystery of Godlinesse, hath delivered six Propositions together, and the subject of all and each of them is God. *Without controversy great is the mystery of godlinesse : God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* And this God which is the subject of all these Propositions, must be understood of Christ, because of him each one is true, and all are so of none but him. He was the Word which was God, and was made flesh, and consequently God manifested in the flesh. Upon him the Spirit descended at his Baptisme, and after his Ascension was poured upon his Apostles, ratifying his Commission, and confirming the doctrine which they received from him : wherefore he was God justified by the Spirit. His Nativity the Angels celebrated, in the discharge of his Office they ministred unto him, at his Resurrection and Ascension they were present, alwayes ready to confesse and adore him : he was therefore God seen of Angels. The Apostles preached unto all Nations, and he whom they preached was * Jesus Christ. The Father † separated S. Paul from his mothers wombe, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son unto him, that he might preach him among the heathen : therefore he was God

1 Tim. 3. 16.

* Heb. 8. 5, 35.

9, 20. 11, 20.

17, 3, 18. 19,

13. Rom. 16.

25. 2 Cor. 1.

19. 1, 4.

Phil. 1. 18.

† Gal. 1. 15, 16.

* *Act. 19. 4.**Gal. 2. 16.**Act. 16. 31.*

preached unto the Gentiles. *John* the Baptist spake [†] *unto* the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on *Christ Jesus*. We have believed in *Jesus Christ*, saith *S. Paul*, who so taught the *Jaylor* trembling at his feet, *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved*: he therefore was God believed on in the world. When he had been forty dayes on earth after his Resurrection, he was taken visibly up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father: wherefore he was God received up in glory. And thus all these six Propositions, according to the plain and familiar language of the Scriptures, are infallibly true of *Christ*, and to of *God*, as he is taken by *S. John*, when he speaks those words, *the Word was God*. But all these cannot be understood of any other, which either is, or is called *God*. For though we grant the divine perfections and attributes to be the same with the divine essence, yet are they never in the Scriptures called *God*; nor can any of them with the least shew of probability be pretended as the subject of these propositions, or afford any tolerable interpretation. When they tell us that *God*, that is, the Will of *God*, was manifested in the flesh, that is, was revealed by men, and received up in glory, that is, was received gloriously on earth, they teach us a language which the

† For *θεός* is
ποι *θέλημα*
θεός, much lesse

† Scriptures know not, and the Holy Ghost never us'd.

is ἀνελήφθῃ received or embraced. *Elias* speaketh not of his reception, but his ascension, when he saith to *Elisha*, τί ποιήσω σοι πρὶν ἢ ἀναληφθῆναι ἀπὸ σοῦ. *2 Kings* 2. 9. and, εὖν ἰδὼς με ἀναλαμβάνομενον ἀπὸ σοῦ. καὶ ἔσται σοι ὅτιος. When he actually ascended, as the Original *ἔστη*, it is no otherwise translated by the Septuagint, then ἀνελήφθῃ Ἡλίας ἐν ὑρατισμῷ ὡς εἰς τὸν ἕρανόν. which language was preserved by the Hellenizing Jews. ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἐν λαίλαπι πυρρῇ. *Syrac.* 48. 9. and again, ἀνελήφθῃ ὡς εἰς τὸν ἕρανόν. *1 Macc.* 2. 48. Neither did they use it of *Elias* onely, but of *Enoch* also. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκπῆδη οἶος ὁ Ἐνώχ, καὶ ᾤδωτός ἀνελήφθῃ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. The same language is continued in the New Testament of our Saviours Ascension, ἀνελήφθῃ εἰς τὸν ἕρανόν. *Mat.* 26. 19. ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀπ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν ἕρανόν. *Act.* 1. 11. and singly, ἀνελήφθῃ. *Act.* 1. 2. and ἀνελήφθῃ ἀπ' ἡμῶν. *Act.* 1. 22. As therefore ἀνδρῶν τῶν

And

Μωϋσῆς in the language of the Jewes, was not the reception of Moses by the Israelites, but the assumption of his body; so *ἀνελήφης τῷ Χριστῷ* is the Ascension of Christ. Luk. 9. 51. Wherefore this being the constant notion of the word, it must so be here likewise understood, *ἀνελήφθῃ ἐν δόξῃ*. as the Vulgar Latine, whose authority is pretended against us, *assumptum est in gloria*; rendering it here by the same word, by which he alwayes translated *ἀνελήφθῃ*.

And as no Attribute, so no person but the Son can be here understood under the name of God. nor the Holy Ghost, for he is distinguished from him, as being justified by the Spirit; nor the Father, who was not manifested in the flesh, nor received up in glory. It remaineth therefore, that whereas the Son is the onely Person to whom all these clearly and undoubtedly belong, which are here joyntly attributed unto God, as sure as the name of God is expressed in all the * Copies of the Originall language, so thus absolutely and subjectively taken must it be understood of Christ.

* For being the Epistle was written in the Greek language, it is

enough if all those Copies do agree. I confesse the Vulgar Latine reads it otherwise; *Quod manifestatum est in carne*. and it cannot be denied but the Syriac, however translated by Tremellius, agreeeth with the Latine; and both seem to have read *ὁ Θεός*. But the joynt consent of all the Greek Copies and Interpreters are above the authority of these two Translatours; nor is the Arabick in this case considerable, as having no such Antiquity as the former. But that which Grotius hath observed is of farre greater consideration. Addit Hincmarus opusculo 55. illud *Θεός* hic positum à Nestorianis. For if at first the Greeks read *ὁ ἐκ πατρὸς γεννητός*, and that it were altered into *Θεός* by the Nestorians; then ought we to correct the Greek Copy by the Latine, and confesse there is not onely no force, but not so much as any ground or colour for our Argument. But first, it is no way probable that the Nestorians should find it in the Originall *ὁ*, and make it *Θεός*, because that by so doing they had overthrown their own Assertion, which was, that God was not incarnate, nor born of the Virgin Mary; that God did not ascend unto heaven, but Christ by the Holy Ghost remaining upon him, *καὶ τὴν ἀνελήφην αὐτῷ χειρομάμων*. Concil. Ephes. part. 1. cap. 17. Secondly, it is certain that they did not make this alteration, because the Catholick Greeks read it *Θεός* before there were such Hereticks. Nestoriani à Nestorio Episcopo Patriarcha Constantinopolitano. Aug. Hæres. Nestorius from whom that Heresy began, was Patriarch of Constantinople after Sisiniius, Sisiniius after Atticus. Atticus after Nestarius, who succeeded Joannes, vulgarly call'd Chrysostomus. But S. Chrysostome read not *ὁ*, but *Θεός*, as appears

Again,

by his Commentaries upon the place. Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν ᾿σαρκί, ταύτην δὲ διήμωρε γός. And S. Cyril, who by all means oppos'd Nestorius upon the first appearance of his Heresy, wrote two large Epistles to the Queens Pulcheria and Eudocia; in both which he maketh great use of this Text: In the first, after the repetition of the words as they are now in the Greek Copies, he proceedeth thus; Τίς ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς; ἢ δῆλον, ὅτι πάντα τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος. ἔτι καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὸ τῆς εὐπρεπείας μυστήριον, Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν ᾿σαρκί. Wherefore in S. Paul be read Θεός God, and took that God to be the Word. In the second, repeating the same text verbatim, he manageth it thus against Nestorius. Εἰ Θεός ὦν ὁ λόγος ἐνανθρωπήσας λέγοιτο, καὶ ἔδη πρὸς μᾶλλον τὸ εἶναι Θεός, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς ἦν αἰὲ διαμένων, μᾶλλον δὴ τότε καὶ ὁμολογούμενος μᾶλλον ὅτι τὸ τῆς εὐπρεπείας μυστήριον. εἰ δὲ ἄνθρωπος νοῖται κοινός ὁ Χριστός, πῶς ἐν σαρκὶ φανερώμενος; καὶ τοι πῶς ἔχ' ἀπασιν ἐναργής, ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐν ᾿σαρκί τε ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐν ἑτέρως ὁρῶτό τις; And in the explanation of his second Anathematisme, he maketh use of no other Text but this, to prove the Hypostaticall Union; giving it this glosse or exposition. τί ὅτι τὸ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; ταύτην γάρ τε οὐκ ἔστι ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, &c. The same he urgeth in his scholion De Uniteniti incarnatione. So also Theodoret contemporary with S. Cyril, Θεός γὰρ ὦν, καὶ θεὸς ὡς, καὶ ἀβεβήτων ἔχων τὴν φύσιν, δῆλον ἅπασιν ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐγένετο, σαφῶς δ' ἡμᾶς διὰ φύσεως ἐδίδαξεν, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ τὴν θεϊκὴν ἐφανερωθῆναι φύσιν. Thirdly, Hincmarus does not say that the Nestorians put Θεός into the Greek text; but that he which put it in was cast out of his Bishoprick for a Nestorian. His words are these. Quidam nimirum ipsas Scripturas verbis illicitis imposturaverunt, sicut Macedonius Constantinopolitanus Episcopus, qui ab Anastasio Imperatore ideo à Civitate expulsus legitur, quoniam falsavit Evangelia, & illum Apostoli locum ubi dicitur, quod apparuit in carne, justificatum est in Spiritu, per cognationem Græcarum literarum O in Θ hoc modo mutando falsavit. Ubi enim habuit Qui, hoc est OΣ monosyllabum Græcum, litera mutata O in Θ vertit, & fecit ΘΣ, id est ut esset, Deus apparuit per carnem. Quapropter tanquam Nestorianus fuit expulsus. Hincm. Opusc. 55. c. 18. Now whereas Hincmarus says expulsus legitur, we read not in Eusebius, or the Excerpta of Theodorus, or in Johannes Malala, that Macedonius was cast out of his Bishoprick for any such falsation; it is therefore probable that he had it from Liberatus a Deacon of the Church of Carthage, who wrote a Breviary, collected partly out of the Ecclesiasticall Histories and Acts of the Councils, partly out of the relations of such men as he thought fit to believe, extant in the fourth Tome of the Councils. In which, chap. 19. we have the same Relation, onely with this difference, that O is not turn'd into Θ but into Ω; and so OΣ becomes not ΘΣ but ΩΣ. So that first the Greek Copies are not said to have read in ὁ but θες, and so not to have relation to the mystery, but to the person of Christ; and therefore this maketh nothing for the vulgar Latine. Secondly, whereas Hincmarus says there was but one letter chang'd, no such mutation can of OΣ make ΘΕΟΣ, it may ΩΣ, as we read in Liberatus; and then this is nothing to the Greek Text. Thirdly, Macedonius was no Nestorian, but Anastasius an Eutychian, and he ejected him as he did other Catholick Bishops under the pretence of Nestorianisme, but for other reasons. Howsoever Ma-

cedonius

cedonius could not falsifie all the Greek Copies, when as well those which were before his time, as those which were written since, all acknowledge $\Theta\epsilon\varsigma$. And if he had been cjesled for substituting $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$, without question Anathasius would have taken care for the restoring $\Theta\varsigma$, which we find not in any Copy. It remaineth therefore that the Nestorians did not falsifie the Text by reading $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$, but that the Ancient Greek Fathers read it so; and consequently, being the Greek is the Original, this Lesson must be acknowledged Authentickall.

Again, S. Paul speaketh thus to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, *Take heed unto your selves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* In these words this doctrinall proposition is clearly contained; God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. For there is no other word either in or near the Text, which can by any Grammaticall construction be joyned with the verb, except the Holy Ghost, to whom the predicate is repugnant, both in respect of the act, or our redemption, and of the means, the blood. If then the Holy Ghost hath not purchased the Church, if he hath not blood to shed for our redemption, *and without bloodshed there is no remission*, if there be no other word to which, according to the literall construction, the act of purchasing can be applied, if the name of God, most frequently joyned to his * Church, * $\tau\eta\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\ \tau\tilde{\upsilon}\ \Theta\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}$. For be immediately and properly applicable by all rules of syntax to the verb which followeth it: then is it of necessity to be received as the subject of this Proposition, then is this to be embraced as infallible Scripture truth; God hath purchased the Church with his own blood. But this *though the Church be properly the Church of Christ, Mat. 16. 18 Col. 1.*

24. and in the plurall we read once $\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\iota\ \tau\tilde{\upsilon}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tilde{\upsilon}$, Rom. 16. 16. as we do of the Churches of God, 1 Cor. 11. 16. 2 Thess. 1. 4. 2, 14. yet $\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\tilde{\upsilon}\ \Theta\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}$ is frequently used, as 1 Cor. 1. 2. 10, 31. 15, 9. 11, 22. 2 Cor. 1. 1, 13. 1 Tim. 3. 5, 15. but $\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\ \tau\tilde{\upsilon}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tilde{\upsilon}$ not once named. And therefore we have no reason to alter it in this Text, or to phansy it first written $\chi\tilde{\upsilon}$, and then made $\Theta\tilde{\upsilon}$, when it is so often written $\Theta\tilde{\upsilon}$, not $\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tilde{\upsilon}$. Some MSS. represent $\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\tilde{\upsilon}\ \Theta\tilde{\upsilon}$, which makes not at all against our argument, but, because in this particular unusuall, not like to be true. The Syriac translating it Christi, gives rather an exposition then a version.

God may and must be understood of Christ: it may, because he hath; it must, because no other person which is called God, hath so purchased the Church. *We were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.* With this price were we bought; and therefore it may well be said, that Christ our God hath purchased us with his own blood. But, no other person which is, or is called God, can be said so to have purchased us, because it is an act belonging properly to the Mediatourship; and *there is but one Mediatour between God and men:* and the Church is *sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.* Nor can the expression of this act, peculiar to the Son, be attributed to the Father, because this blood signifieth death; and though the Father be omnipotent, and can do all things, yet he cannot die. And though it might be said that he purchased us, because he gave his Son to be a ranfome for us, yet it cannot be said that he did it *by his own blood*; for then it would follow, that he gave not his Son, or that the Son and the Father were the same person. Beside it is very observable, that this particular phrase of *his own blood*, is in the Scripture put by way of opposition to the blood of † another: and howsoever we may attribute the acts of the Son unto the Father, because sent by him, yet we cannot but acknowledge that the blood and death was of another then the Father. *Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place.* and whereas the High priest entered every year with the blood of others, Christ appeared once to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. He then which purchased us, wrought it by his own blood, as an High priest opposed to the Aaronicall, who made atonement by the blood of others. But the Father taketh no priestly Office, neither could he be opposed to the legall Priest, as not dying himself, but giving another. Wherefore wheresoever the Father and the Son are described

1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Heb. 10. 10.

† ἵδιον αἷμα
is opposed to
αἷμα ἄλλο.
ἑτέρου.

Heb. 9. 12.

scribed together as working the salvation of man, the blood by which it is wrought is attributed to the Son, not to the Father: as when S. Paul speaketh of the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness; his, that is, his own righteousness, hath reference to God the Father; but his, that is, his own blood, must be refer'd to Christ the Son. When he glorifieth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, attributing unto him, that he hath blessed, elected, predestinated, adopted, accepted us, made known unto us the mystery of his will, and gathered us together in one; in the midst of this acknowledgment he brings in *the beloved, in whom we have redemption through his blood*, as that which cannot be attributed to the Father. Christ hath blessed us, and the Apostle saith, the Father hath blessed us: which is true, because he sent his son to bless us. Christ hath made known unto us the will of his Father, and the Apostle saith, the Father hath made known unto us the mystery of his will; because he sent his Son to reveal it. Christ hath delivered us, and the Father is said to deliver us from the power of darkness; not that we are twice delivered, but because the Father delivereth us by his Son. And thus these generall Acts are familiarly attributed to them both; but still a difference must be observed and acknowledged in the means or manner of the performance of these Acts. For though 'tis true, that the Father and the Son revealed to us the will of God; yet it is not true that the Father revealed it by himself to us: but that the Son did so, it is. They both deliver us from sin and death: but the Son gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us; the Father is not, cannot be, said to have given himself, but his Son; and therefore the Apostle giveth thanks unto the Father, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood.

Rom. 3. 25.

ὁν παρὰ θεοῦ
 θεὸς ἰλασμενίου
 διὰ τῆς πίστεως
 ὅς ἐστιν πρὸς αὐ-
 τὴν ἁμαρτίαν
 ἐνδείξιν τῆς
 δικαιοσύνης
 αὐτοῦ.

Eph. 1. 6. 7.

A. 3. 26.

Eph. 1. 9.

Gal. 1. 4.

Col. 1. 13, 14.

Heb. 9. 16.

Now this blood is not onely the blood of the new Covenant, and consequently, of the Mediatour: but the nature of this Covenant is such, that it is also a Testament, and therefore the blood must be the blood of the Testatour; *for where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testatour.* But the Testatour which died, is not, cannot be the Father, but the Son, and consequently, the blood is the blood of the Son, not of the Father. It remaineth therefore that God, who purchased the Church with his own blood, is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, or any other which is called God, but onely Jesus Christ the Son of God, and God. And thus have I proved the first of the three Assertions, that the name of God absolutely taken and placed subjectively, is sometimes to be understood of Christ.

Mat. 1. 23.

† καὶ καλεῖται
τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
Ἐμμανουήλ, ὃ
ἐστὶ μεθερμηνεύ-
μενον, Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ
Θεός.

Ex. 17. 15.

Judg. 6. 24.

Jer. 33. 16.

The second, That the name of God invested by way of excellency with an Article, is attributed in the Scriptures unto Christ, may be thus made good. He which is call'd Emmanuel, is named God by way of Excellency; for that name, saith S. Matthew, *being interpreted, is God with us*, and in that interpretation the Greek † Article is prefixed. But Christ is called Emmanuel; *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, saying, Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel.* Therefore he is that God with us, which is expressed by way of excellency, and distinguished from all other who are any way honoured with that name. For it is a vain imagination to think that Christ is call'd Emmanuel, but that he is not what he is called: as Moses built an Altar and call'd the name of it, *Jehovah Nissi*, and Gideon another, call'd *Jehovah shalom*; and yet neither Altar was Jehovah: as *Jerusalem* was call'd, *the Lord our righteousness*, and yet that city was not the Lord. Because these two notions which are conjoynd in the name Emmanuel, are severally true of Christ. First, he is Emmanuel, that

that is, with us, for he hath *dwelt among us*: and when he parted from the earth, he said to his disciples, *I am with you alway even to the end of the world.* Secondly, he is *El*, and that name was given him, as the same Prophet testified, *For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellour, the Mighty God.* He then who is both properly called *El*, that is, God, and is also really *Emmanu*, that is, with us, he must infallibly be that *Emmanuel*, who is God with us. Indeed if the name *Emmanuel* were to be interpreted by way of a proposition, God is with us, as *the Lord our righteousness*, and *the Lord is there*, must be understood where they are the names of Jerusalem; then should it have been the name not of Christ, but of his Church: and if we under the Gospel had been called so, it could have received no other interpretation in reference to us. But being it is not ours, but our Saviour's name, it bears no kind of similitude with those objected appellations, and is as properly and directly to be attributed to the *Messias*, as the name of *Jesus*. Wherefore it remaineth that Christ be acknowledged God with us, according to the Evangelicall interpretation, with an expression of that excellency which belongeth to the supreme Deity.

Again, He to whom *S. Thomas* said, *my Lord, and my God*, or rather, the Lord of me, and the God of me, he is that God, before whose name the Greek * Article is * ὁ Κύριός μου, prefixed, which they require, by way of excellency. But *S. Thomas* spake these words to Christ. For *Jesus* spake unto *Thomas*, and *Thomas* answered and said unto him, *My Lord and my God.* And in these words he made confession, *art my God*; or an *Antiptosis*, the Nominative case used for the Vocative, as ἐλὼν, ἰλὼν, ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου. Mark 15. 34. ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ, Mark 14. 36, and Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Joh. 19. 3. If it be an *Ellipsis* of the Verb & so frequent in the Scriptures, and of the Person sufficiently understood in the preceding Pronoun; then is it evident that ὁ θεός is attributed unto Christ, for then *S. Thomas* said unto him, *Thou art ὁ θεός μου.* If it be an *Antiptosis*, though the construction

require not a verb, yet the signification virtually requireth as much, which is equivalent; for he acknowledgeth him as much God while he calleth him so, as if he did affirm he is so. and being these words were an expression of the Apostles faith, as Christ understood and approved them, they must contain in them, virtually at least, a Proposition; because no act of our faith can be expressed, where the Object is not at least a virtuall Proposition. And in that Proposition, *ō Dds* must be the predicate, and Christ to whom these words are spoken must also be the subject. It cannot therefore be avoided, but that S. Thomas did attribute the name of God to our Saviour with an Article. Indeed to me there is no doubt but S. Thomas in these words did make as true and reall a confession of his faith concerning the Person of Christ, as S. Peter did, when he answered and said; Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, Mat. 16. 16. and consequently, that *ō xύς* and *ō θεός* do as properly belong unto him, as S. Peter's *ō Χεῖρς*, and *ō υἱός*.

cession of his faith; for our Saviour replied, *Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed.* And let him be the Lord of me, and the God of me, who was the Lord, and the God of an Apostle.

Nor have we only their required testimony of Christs supreme Divinity, but also an addition of verity asserting that supremacy. For he is not onely termed *the God*, but, for a farther certainty, *the true God*: and the same Apostle who said the Word was God, lest any cavil should arise by any omission of an Article, though so frequently neglected by all, even the most accurate Authours, hath also assured us that he is the true God. For, *we know*, saith he, *that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ.* This is the true God, and eternall life. As therefore we read in the Acts, of the Word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all: where it is acknowledged that the Lord of all is by the pronoun *he* joyned unto Jesus Christ, the immediate, not unto God, the remote antecedent: So likewise here *the true God*, is to be referred unto Christ, who stands next unto it; not unto the Father, spoken of indeed in the Text, but at a distance. There is no reason alledged why these

a 1 Joh. 5. 20.
ἐτός θεῶν ὁ ἀ-
ληθινός θεός
ὃς ἡ ζωὴ αἰ-
ωνίου.

Hic agitur non
solum de ve o
Deo, sed de illo
uno vero Deo,
ut articulus in
Græco additus
indicat. Catech.
Racov.

b Act. 10. 36.
* ἔτ' for ὅς:
as Act. 8. 26.
ἀπὸ Ἰερουσα-
λὴμ εἰς Γαζαν,
αὐτὴν ἐστὶν ἑν-
μῶν, quæ est
deserta.

last words should not be referred to the Son of God, but only this, that in grammaticall construction they may be ascribed to the Father. As, when *another king arose which knew not Joseph, the same dealt subtilly with our kindred*; the same referreth us not to *Joseph*, but to the King of *Egypt*. Whereas, if nothing else can be objected, but a possibility in respect of the grammaticall construction, we may as well say that *Joseph* dealt subtilly with his kindred, as the King of *Egypt*: for whatsoever the incongruity be in History, it makes no solecisme in the syntax. Wherefore being Jesus Christ is the immediate Antecedent to which the Relative may properly be referr'd; being the Son of God is he of whom the Apostle chiefly speaketh; being this is rendred as a reason why *we are in him that is true*, by being *in his Son*, to wit, because that *Son is the true God*; being in the language of *S. John* the constant title of our Saviour is eternall life; being all these reasons may be drawn out of the text it self, why the title of the true God should be attributed to the Son, and no one reason can be raised from thence why it should be referred to the Father; I can conclude no lesse, then that our Saviour is *the true God*, so stiled by way of eminency, with an Article prefixed.

Act. 7. 18, 19.

But thirdly, were there no such particular place in which the Article were expressed, yet shall we find such adjuncts fixed to the name of God when attributed unto Christ, as will prove equivalent to an Article, or whatsoever may expresse the supreme Majesty. As when *S. Paul* doth magnifie the *Jewes*, out of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen. First, it is evident that Christ is called † *God*, even he who came of the *Jewes*, though not

Rom. 9. 5.

† Though some would leave

God out of the Text, upon this pretense; because *S. Cyprian Lib. 2. Adv. Judæos*, citing this place, leaves it out. But that must needs be by the negligence of some of the Scribes, as is evident; first, because *Manutius* and *Morellius* found the word *Deus*

as

in their copies, and both the MSS. which Pamelius us'd acknowledge it. Secondly, because S. Cypr. produceth the text to prove Quod Deus Christus; and reckoneth it among the rest in which he is call'd expressly God. Thirdly, because Tertullian, whose disciple S. Cyprian professed himself, did both so read it and so use it. Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem Apostolus. Ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne. Adv. Praxeam. And again in the same Book: Hunc & Paulus conspexit, nec tamen Patrem visit. Nonne inquit, vidi Jesum? Christum autem & ipsum Deum cognominavit. Quorum Patres, & ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est per (vel super) omnia Deus benedictus in ævum. Novatianus de Trinitate useth the same Argument. And another ancient Authour very expressly; Rogo te, Deum credis esse filium, an non? Sine dubio, responsurus es, Deum. quia etiam negare volueris, sanctis Scripturis convinceris, dicente Apostolo, Ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula. So also S. Aug. Non solum Pater Deus est, sicut etiam omnes hæretici concedunt, sed etiam Filius, quod velint nolint, coguntur fateri, dicente Apostolo, Qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula. De Trin. l. 2. c. 13. & contra Faustum. l. 16. c. 15. As for the Objection, that S. Chrysostome doth not signifie in his Commentaries, that he read θεός in the Text: I answer that, neither does he signifie that he read ὁ ὅτι πάντων, for in his exposition he passeth over wholly ὁ ὅτι πάντων θεός but it doth not follow that he read not ὁ ὅτι πάντων in the Text. But when he repeats the words of the Apostle, he agrees wholly with the Greek Text, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός εὐλογητός. and Theodoret, who lived not long after him, doth not only acknowledge the words, but give a full Exposition of them. Ἡρεκεῖ μὲν ἡ τὴν κατὰ σὰρκα προσηγορίαν παρομιλήσασθαι τὴν θεοσύνην Χριστῷ τῷ θεότητι· ἀλλ' ὡς περὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἰρηκαῶς, τὴν γενομένην ἐκ σπύματος τοῦ Δαβὶδ κατὰ σὰρκα, ἐπιμαχεῖ, τὴν δευτέραν δὲ ἢ τὴν ἐν δυνάμει ὡς ἐν ταῦθα ἐπὶ πᾶσι κατὰ σὰρκα, προσέδεικε τὸ, ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός εὐλογητός, ὡς τὸς αἰῶνας. As for the omission of D. us in S. Hilary on the Psalmes, it must of necessity be attributed to the negligence of the Scribe, not to the reading of the Father. For how he read it he hath clearly expressed in his books De Trinitate. Non ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicens, Quorum sunt Patres, & ex quibus Christus, qui est super omnia Deus. Non hic creatura in Deum deputatur, sed creaturæ Deus est, qui super omnia Deus est.

τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα opposed unto τὸ κατὰ πνεῦμα. as Rom. 1. 3.

where κατὰ σὰρκα is used without an article, because κατὰ πνεῦμα to which it is opposed followeth, and so the opposition is of it self apparent. But here being

as he came of them, that is, according to the flesh, which is here distinguished from his Godhead. Secondly, he is so called God, as not to be any of the many Gods, but the one supreme or most high God;

καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα is not to be expressed in the following words, the article τὸ, signifying of it self a distinction or exception, sheweth that it is to be understood.

† for he is God over all. Thirdly, he hath also added the title of *blessed*; which of it self elsewhere signifieth the supreme God, and was alwayes used by the *Jewes* to expresse that one God of *Israel*. Wherefore it cannot be conceived S. Paul should write unto the Christians, most of which then were converted *Jewes* or proselytes, and give unto our Saviour not only the name of God, but also adde that title which they alwayes gave unto the one God of *Israel*, and to none but him; except he did intend they should believe him to be the same God, whom they alwayes in that manner and under that notion had adored. As therefore the Apostle speaketh of *a the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore*, of the Creatour, *who is blessed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth signifie the supreme Deity, which was so glorified by the *Israelites*; and doth also

† ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. *Net* in omnibus, as Erasmus, nor super omnes, as Beza, with reference to the Fathers, which should have been ὁμῶς πάντων αὐτῶν; but as the Vulgar Translation, & the Ancient Fathers before that, super omnia, ὡς for ἐπὶ πάντων, as Job. 3.

31. ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστὶ. which signifies no lesse then *high*, the ordinary name of God, ὁ ὕψιστος, the most high: as it is taken for the supreme God by it self, Act. 7. 48. and is described, Pl. 97. 9. Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπὶ πάντων τὴν γῆν, σφόδρα ὑπερῷον πάντας τὰς θεάς. * As Mark 14. 61. Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἐυλογητοῦ; Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? where the vulgar attribute is taken for God himself, which is usually added to the name of God; as 2 Cor. 11. 31. ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν ἐυλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας. or any description of him; as ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς ὄν ἐυλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν. And these expressions of S. Paul are consonant to the ancient custome of the Jewes, who, when the Priest in the Sanctuary rehearsed the Name of God, were wont to answer, Blessed be his name for ever. Inasmuch as the Blessed one, did signifie in their language, as much as the Holy one, and both, or either of them, the God of Israel. Hence are so frequent in the Rabbins, הוּא הַקְדוֹשׁ הַבְּרוּךְ the holy blessed one, and הוּא הַבְּרוּךְ, the Blessed one; that they are written by abbreviation הַקְדָּבָה, and the infinite blessed one בְּרָכָה אֵל. Blessed be God for ever, Amen, and Amen. בְּרָכָה and וְלָא. a 2 Cor. 11. 31. Rom. 1. 25.

testifie that we worship the same God under the Gospel, which they did under the Law: so doth he speak of Christ in as sublime a stile, *who is over all, God blessed for ever, Amen*; and thereby doth testifie the equality, or rather identity of his Deity. If we consider the scope of the Apostle, which is to magnifie the *Israelites* by the enumeration of such priviledges as belonged peculiarly to that chosen nation, (the most eminent of which was contained in the Genealogy of our Saviour) we shall find their glory did not consist in this, that Christ at first was born of them a man, and afterwards made a God: for what great honour could accrue to them by the nativity of a man, whose Godhead is referred not to his birth, but to his death? whereas this is truly honourable, and the peculiar glory of that nation, that the most High God blessed for ever should *take on him the seed of Abraham*, and come out of the *Israelites as concerning the flesh*. Thus every way it doth appear, the Apostle spake of Christ as of the one eternall God.

He then who was the Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God; He whose glory *Isaiah* saw as the glory of the God of *Israel*; He who is stiled Alpha and Omega without any restriction or limitation; He who was truly subsisting in the form of God, and equall with him, before he was in the nature of man; He who being man is frequently called God, and that in all those wayes by which the supreme Deity is expressed; He had a being before Christ was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, and the being which he had was the one eternall and indivisible divine essence, by which he alwayes was truly, really, and properly God. But all these are certainly true of him, in whom we believe, Jesus Christ; as hath been proved by clear testimonies of the sacred Scriptures. Therefore the being which Christ had before he was conceived of the Virgin, was

was not any created, but the divine essence; nor was he any Creature, but the true eternall God: which was our second Assertion, particularly opposed to the * *Arrian* heresy.

* This Heresy
was so called
from two who

bore the same name, and fell at the same time into the same opinion: one of them being a Presbyter, and Rector of a Church in Alexandria, the other a Deacon; as Alexander the Bishop of Alexandria in his Epistle extant in Theodoret. Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἀναθεματισθέντες αἱρεσιῶται ὑπὸ πρεσβυτέρων μὲν Ἀρειος, ἀπὸ διακόνων δὲ, Ἀρχιδιάκω, Εὐζείδιος, Ἀριστερος, &c. in the Epistle of the Arrians to Alexander, he is reckoned amongst the Presbyters. Ἀρειος, Ἀριδικλῆς, Ἀρχιδιάκω, Καρπῶν, Σαρματῆς, Ἀρειος, πρεσβύτεροι. Of these two Phœbadius contra Arrian. Patrem & Filium esse non unam personam, ut Sabellius, aut duas substantias, ut Arrii. c. 25. The Heresy is so well known, that it needs no explication: and indeed it cannot be better described then in the Anathematisme of the Nicene Council. Τὸς δὲ λέγοντας ἢν ποτε ὅτε ἐκ ἡν, καὶ πάλιν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἡν, καὶ ὅτι ὁ ἐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ὅτι ἕτερας ὑποστάσεις ἢ ἕσας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, ἢ πρῶτον τὸν ὕδιν τῷ θεῷ, τέτταρς ἀναθεματίζον ἡ Καθολικὴ καὶ Ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία. thus translated by S. Hilary. Eos autem qui dicunt, erat quando non erat, & antequam nasceretur non erat, & quod de non extantibus factus est, vel ex alia substantia aut essentia, dicentes esse convertibilem & demutabilem Deum, hos anathematizat Catholica Ecclesia.

The third Assertion, next to be demonstrated, is, That the divine essence which Christ had, as the Word, before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*. he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father. For this is not to be denied, That there can be but one essence properly divine, and so but one God of infinite wisdom, power, and majesty; that there can be but * one person originally of himself subsisting in that infinite being, because a plurality of more persons so subsisting would necessarily inferre a multiplicity of Gods; that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is originally God, as not receiving his eternall being from any other. Wherefore it necessarily followeth that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a person subsisting in the divine nature originally of himself, and consequently, being we have already prov'd that he is truly and pro-

* Εἰς ὃ οἱ
δαμν ἀγέννη-
τον, καὶ μίαν
τῆς πάντων
ἀρχὴν τὸν πα-
τέρα τῷ κυρίῳ
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστῷ. S. Basil.
Ep. 78. Ἐν
ἀγέννητον ὁ
πατήρ. Alex.
Epist. apud
Theodoretum.

Job. 16. 19.

Πάντα ὅσα

ἔχει ὁ πατήρ

ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὄντι, ὡς

ἐμπαλιν τὰ

ὅσα ἔχει τῷ πα-

τρί. ἔδεν ἐν

ἰδίῳ, ὅτι κοι-

νὰ, ἐπὶ καὶ

αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι

κοιτὸν καὶ ὁμο-

τιμον, οἱ καὶ τῷ

ἡμῶν πατρὶ τῷ

πατρί.

S. Greg. Naz.

Orat. 2. de

Filio.

a Joh. 5. 26.

Hoc dixit, vi-

tam dedit filio

ut haberet eam

in semetipso,

tanquam dice-

rer, pater qui

est vita in se-

metipso, genuit

filium qui esset

vita in semetipso.

Pro eo enim quod est

genuit, vo-

lunt intelligi dedit,

tanquam si cuiquam

diceremus, dedit tibi

Deus esse. S. Aug.

et paulo post.

Quid ergo filio

dedit? dedit ei ut

filius esset. Genuit

ut vita esset,

hoc est, dedit

habere ei vitam

in semetipso, ut

esset vita non

egens vita, ne

participando

perly the eternall God, he must be understood to have the Godhead communicated to him by the Father, who is not onely eternally, but originally God. *All things whatsoever the Father hath, are mine*, saith Christ; because in him is the same fulnesse of the Godhead, and more then that the Father cannot have: but yet in that perfect and absolute equality there is notwithstanding this disparity, that the Father hath the Godhead not from the Son, nor any other, whereas the Son hath it from the Father. Christ is the true God and eternall life; but that he is so, is from the Father: for *as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself*, not by participation, but by communication. 'Tis true, our Saviour was so in the form of God, that he thought it no robbery to be equall with God: but when the Jews sought to kill him because he *made himself equall with God*, he answered them, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do*; by that connexion of his operations, shewing the reception of his essence; and by the acknowledgement of his power, professing his substance from the Father. From whence he which was equall, even in that equality

genuit filium qui esset vita in semetipso. Pro eo enim quod est genuit, volunt intelligi dedit, tanquam si cuiquam diceremus, dedit tibi Deus esse. S. Aug. et paulo post. Quid ergo filio dedit? dedit ei ut filius esset. Genuit ut vita esset, hoc est, dedit habere ei vitam in semetipso, ut esset vita non egens vita, ne participando intelligatur habere vitam. Si enim participando haberet vitam non in semetipso, posset & amittendo esse sine vita: hoc in filio ne accipias, ne cogites, ne credas. Manet ergo Pater vita, manet & Filius vita. Pater vita in semetipso, non a Filio; Filius vita in semetipso, sed a Patre. So again de Trinit. l. 1. c. 12. Plerumque cicit, dedit mihi Pater, in quo vult intelligi quod eum genuerit Pater; non ut tanquam jam existenti & non habenti dederit aliquid, sed ipsum dedisse ut haberet, genuisse est ut esset. b Joh. 5. 18. 19. Tanquam diceret, quid scandalizati estis quia Patrem meum dixi Deum, quia aequalem me facio Deo? Ita sum aequalis, ut non ille a me, sed ego ab illo sim. Hoc enim intelligitur in his verbis, Non potest Filius a se facere quicquam, &c. hoc est, quicquid Filius habet ut faciat, a Patre habet ut faciat. Quare habet a Patre ut faciat? quia a Patre habet ut possit, quia a Patre habet ut sit. Filio enim hoc est esse quod posse.

confesseth

S. Aug. in locum. paulo post, Hoc est, Non potest Filius à se quicquam facere, quod esset, si diceret, non est Filius à se. Etenim si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, ab illo est de quo natus est.

confesseth a priority, saying, *The Father is greater then* ὁ πατήρ ὁ μέγας
 I. The Son equall in respect of his nature, the Father μεῖζον μὲν
 greater in reference to the communication of the θεῖ τῆς αἰτίας,
 Godhead. *I know him*, saith Christ, *for I am from* τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ
 him. And because he is from the Father, † therefore he is οὐκ αὐτός.
 called by those of the Nicene Council in their Creed, God S. Greg Naz.
 of God, light of light, very God of very God. The Orat. 2. de
 Father is God, but not of God, light, but not of light; Filio.
 Christ is God, but of God, light, but of light. There is a Joh. 7. 29.
 no difference or inequality in the nature or essence, † so S. Aug.
 because the same in both; but the Father of our Lord hath observed.
 Jesus Christ hath that essence of himself from Ab ipso, in-
 none, Christ hath the same not of himself, but from quit, sum, quia
 him. Filius de Pa-
 tre, & quic-
 quid est filius
 de illo est, cu-
 jus est filius.

Ideo Dominum Jesum dicimus Deum de Deo, Patrem non dicimus Deum de Deo, sed tantum Deum. Et dicimus Dominum Jesum lumen de lumine, Patrem non dicimus lumen de lumine, sed tantum lumen. Ad hoc ergo pertinet quod dixi, ab ipso sum. From hence then did the Nicene Council gather those words of their Creed, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, καὶ φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινῷ. but not immediately, for they were partly in some of the Orientall Creeds before; as appeareth by that Confession which Eusebius presented to the Council, as containing what he had believed and taught ever since his Baptisme, in which he had these words, καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τῷ Θεῷ λόγον, θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς. And as Eusebius calls him life of life, so others power of power, and wisdom of wisdom. Ideo Christus virtus & sapientia Dei, quia de Patre virtute & sapientia etiam ipse virtus & sapientia est, sicut lumen de Patre lumine, & fons vitæ apud Deum Patrem unigue fontem vitæ. S. Aug. de Trin. l. 7. c. 3. and not onely so, but essence of essence. Pater & Filius simul una sapientia, quia una essentia; & singillatim sapientia de sapientia, sicut essentia de essentia.

And being the divine nature, as it is absolutely immateriall and incorporeall, is also indivisible, Christ cannot have any part of it onely communicated unto him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged

* ὁμοούσιος,
which is coes-
sentiall or con-
substantiall, is
not to be ta-
ken of a part of

* Coessentiall, of the same substance with the Father, as the Council of Nice determin'd, and the ancient Fathers before them taught. Hence appeareth the truth of those words of our Saviour, which raised a second motion in the divine essence, as if the Son were a part of the essence of the Father, and so of the same nature with him, which was the opinion of the Manichees. Οὐχ ὡς Οὐαλεντίνος ὡς βολὴν τὸ γέννημα τῷ Πατρὶ ἐδουμάτισεν· ἢ ὡς Μανιχαῖος μέρους ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸ γέννημα εἰσενήσατο. as Arius in his Epistle to Alexander. By the interpretation of S. Hilary: Nec ut Valentinus prolationem natum Patris commentatus est; nec, sicut Manichæus, partem unius substantiæ Patris natum exposuit. de Trinit. l. 6. Quod Hilarius ita Latine reddidit, tanquam ὁμοούσιον id significaret, quod partem substantiæ habet ex toto resectam, says Dionys. Petavius, with ut any reason; for S. Hilary clearly translates ὁμοούσιον barely unius substantiæ, and it was in the Originall μέρ· ὁμοούσιον, which he expressed by partem unius substantiæ. Under this notion first the Arians pretended to refuse the name ὁμοούσιον, as Arius in the same Epistle signifieth, lest thereby they should admit a real composition and division in the Deity. Εἰ τὸ ἐν μαςθεῖς, καὶ τὸ ἐν Πατρὶ· Ἰησοῦν, ὡς μέρ· τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ καὶ ὡς ὡς βολὴν ὑπὸ τιναν νοήται, συνδεδεῖται ὁ Πατὴρ, καὶ διαρετὸς, καὶ τετρεῖς. And S. Hierome testifies thus much not only of Arius and Eunomius, but also of Origen before them. Habetur Dialogus apud Græcos Originis, & Candidi Valentiniani Hæresicos defensoris. Quos duos Andabatas digladiantes spectasse me fateor. Dicit Candidus, Filium de Patris esse substantia, errans in eo quod ὡς βολὴν asserit: E regione Origenes, juxta Arrium & Eunomium, repugnat eum vel prolatum esse vel natum, ne Deus Pater dividatur in partes. Apol. 2. in Ruffin. And therefore Eusebius Bishop of Cæsarea refused not to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, being so interpreted as that objection might be taken away. Τὸ ἐν τῆς ὑσίας ὡς μολόγησεν πρὸς αὐτῶν δηλωτικὸν εἶναι τῷ, καὶ μὲν τῷ Πατρὶ εἶναι, καὶ μὲν ὡς μέρ· ὑπάρχειν τῷ Πατρὶ. Upon this Confession he subscribed to that clause, begotten of the substance of the Father, which was not in his own Creed. And again, Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ, ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν υἱόν, ὁ μεταφράζων ὁ λόγος συνίστησιν ἡ κατὰ τῆς ὡμολογίας τῶν πατέρων, ὡς ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς ζώοις παρεπλησίως ἔτερον κατὰ διαίρεσιν τῆς ὑσίας, ἔτε κατὰ ἀποτομήν, &c. Upon this acknowledgement he was persuaded to subscribe to the other clause also (added to that Creed which he himself gave in to the Council,) being of one substance with the Father: which clause was inserted by the Council, at the instance of Constantine the Emperour. Now as the Manichees made use of the word ὁμοούσιος to expresse their errors concerning the nature of God and the person of Christ; so the Ancient Fathers, before the Nicene Council, had used the same in a true Catholick sense to expresse the unity in essence of the Father and the Son; as appeareth by the confession of the same Eusebius, Ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶ παλαιῶν λόγος τινὰς, καὶ ἀποφαντὴς ὁπισκόπους, καὶ συγγεφῶτας ἔγνωμεν, ἐπὶ τῆς τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ

the

θεολογίας πρὸ τῷ ὁμοουσίῳ συγγενεσμένους ὀνόματι. Wherefore the other Eusebius of Nicomedia, understanding the ancient Catholick sense, confessed that if they believed Christ to be the true begotten, and not created Son of God, they must acknowledge him ὁμοούσιον, which the Arians endeavoured to make so odious; and therefore the Council in opposition to them determined it. Quid est aliud cur Homousion Patri nolint Filium dici, nisi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium? sicut Author ipsorum Eusebius Nicomediensis Epistola sua prodidit, dicens, Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium, & increatum dicimus, Homousion cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum lecta esset Epistola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in Tractatu fidei posuerunt Patres, quod id viderunt adversariis esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput hæresis amputarent. S. Ambros. l. 3. de Fide, c. 7. De voce ὁμοούσιος, vide Dionys. Petav. de Trinir. l. 4. c. 6.

the Jewes to stone him; *I and the Father are one.* where the plurality of the verb, and the neutrality of the noun, with the distinction of their persons speak a perfect identity of their essence. And though Christ say, the Father is in me, and I in him; yet withall he saith, *I came out from the Father*: by the former shewing the divinity of his essence, by the later the origination of himself. We must not look upon the divine nature as *steril, but rather acknowledge and admire the secundity, and communicability of it self, upon which the † creation of the world dependeth; God making all things by his Word, to whom he first communicated that omnipotency which is the cause of all things. And this may suffice for the illustration of our third Assertion, that the Father hath communicated the divine essence to the Word, who is that Jesus, who is the Christ.

The fourth Assertion followeth, That the Communication of the divine essence by the Father, is the generation of the Son; and Christ, who was eternally God, not of himself, but from the Father, is the eternall Son of God. That God alwayes had a Son, appeareth by Agur's question in the Proverbs of Solomon, *Who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name? and what is his Son's name, if thou canst tell?* And it was the chief design of Mahomet to deny this truth, because he knew it

was

* ἀδωάτων γὰρ τὸν θεὸν εἰπεῖν ἔρημον τῆς φύσεως γονιμότητος. Damasc. l. 1. c. 8.
† Εἰ δὲ μὴ καρποφόρος εἴη αὐτῇ ἡ θεία οὐσία, ἀλλ' ἔρημος κατ' αὐτὴς, ὡς οὗς μὴ φωνίζον, καὶ πηγὴ ἔρημὸς πῶς δημιουργικὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτὸν ἔχον λέγοντες ἔκ αὐτοῦ γονοῦται; S. Athan. Orat. 3.

was not otherwise possible to preferre himself before our Saviour. One Prophet may be greater then another, and *Mahomet* might perswade his credulous disciples that he was greater then any of the sons of men; but while any one was believed to be the eternall Son of God, he knew it wholly impossible to preferre himself before him. Wherefore he frequently inculcates that blasphemy in his * *Alcoran*, that God hath no such Son, nor any equall with him: and his disciples have † corrupted the Psalm of *David*, reading in stead of *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, Thou art my Prophet, I have educated thee. The later || *Jewes* acknowledging the words and the proper literall reading of them, apply them so unto *David*, as that they deny them to belong to Christ, and that upon no other ground, then that by such an exposition they may avoid the Christians Confession. But by the consent of the ancient *Jewes*, by the interpretation of the blessed Apostles, we know these words

* This is often repeated there, and particularly in the last chapter but one, called Alechlas. Et ipse Deus unicus, Deus æternus, qui nec genuit, nec genitus est, & cui nullus est æqualis. And

the Saracenica set forth by Sylburgius, mention this as the first principle of Mahometanism. Ὅτι ὁ εἰς θεὸς ὅς ἐστι, ποιητὴς τοῦ κόσμου, μήτε γινώσκεις, μήτε γινώσκου. And Joannes Siculus and Georgius Cedrenus relate how Mahomet gave command, Ἐν αὐτῷ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τιμᾶν ὡς λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μὲν, καὶ τὸν δέ. And we read of his ridiculous History, that Christ, after his ascension into heaven, was accused by God for calling himself his Son; and that he denied it, as being so named onely by men without any authority from him. Ὅτι ἀνελθόντα τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν ὑπεραν ἡρώπιον ὁ θεός, λέγων, ὅτι Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἔπειτα τὸν λόγον τῦτον, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεός. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι ἔκ ἐκείνου ἐγώ, καὶ ἐκ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ υἱός. ἀλλ' οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν ὅτι ἔπειτα τὸν λόγον τῦτον. † Alfiruzabadi in his Kamuz. Dictum Dei omnipotentis ad Jesum (cui propitius sit & pacem concedat Deus) Tu es Nabiya, Propheta meus, ego Walladtoca, fovi te; at dixerunt Christiani, Tu es Bonaiya, filius meus, Ego Waladtoca, te genui. Longe est supra hæc Deus. And to the same purpose Ebnol Achir. In Evangelio dixit Iſa, Ego Walladtoca, i. e. educavi te; at Christiani dempra litera Lam altera, ipsum ei filium statuerunt. Qui longe elatus est super ea quæ dicunt. Whereas then the Apostles attributed those words of the Psalm to Christ, the Mahometans, who could not deny but they were spoken of the Messiah, were forced to corrupt the Text; and for that they pretend the eminency and excellency of the Godhead, as if it were beneath the Majesty of God to beget a Son, or be a Father. And indeed whosoever would bring in another Prophet greater then Christ, as he was then Moses, must do so. || I say, the

belong

later Jewes so attribute those words to David, as if they belonged not to the Messias. but the ancient Jewes understood them of the Christ, as appeareth not onely out of those places in the Evangelists, where the Christ and the Son of God are synonymous; but also by the testimony of the later Jewes themselves, who have confessed no lesse. So Rabbi David Kimchi in the end of his Commentaries on the second Psalm, וְיִפְרֹשׁ זֶה הַמִּזְמוֹר עַל גִּיּוֹג וּמִגִּיּוֹג וְהַמְשִׁיחַ הוּא מֶלֶךְ הַמְשִׁיחַ וְכֵן פִּירֵשׁ רַבּוֹתֵינוּ. Some interpret this Psalm of Gog and Magog, and the anointed is Messias the King; and so our Doctours of happy memory have expounded it. And Rabbi Solomon Jarchi not onely confesseth that the Ancient Rabbins did interpret it of the Messias, but shews the reason why the later Jewes understood it rather of David, that thereby they might the better answer the Argument of the Christians deduced from thence, רַבּוֹתֵינוּ דְּרִשׁוּ אֶת הַעֲנִיָּן עַל מֶלֶךְ הַמְשִׁיחַ וּלְפִי מִשְׁמַעוֹ. Our Doctours have expounded it of the Messias: but as to the literal sense, and for the answering Hereticks (that is, in their language, Christians) it is rather to be interpreted of David in his own person.

belong to Christ, and, in the most proper sense, to him alone. For, unto which of the Angels said he at any time, *Heb. 1. 5.* thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, as the Apostle argues? and if he had spoken them unto any other man, as they were spoken unto him, the Apostle's Argument had been none at all.

Now that the Communication of the divine essence by the Father (which we have already proved) was the true and proper generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear: Because the most proper generation which we know, is nothing else but a vitall production of another in the same nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced. Thus man begetteth a son, that is, produceth another man of the same humane nature with himself; and this production, as a perfect generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of pater-
 nity in him that produceth, and of filiation in him that is produced. Thus after the prolificall benediction, *Be fruitful and multiply, Adam begat in his own likeness, after his image*; and by the continuation of the same blessing, the succession of humane generations hath been con-

Gen. 1, 29.
5. 3.

* Κοινόν

ἡ ἀρχὴ πα-
σι καὶ τῷ τοῦ
δακτον ὁμο-
λόγημα, ὡς
ἅπας ὁ δὲ τῆς
αὐτῆς ὄντι τῷ
γεννηκώτι
ὅσας καὶ φύ-
σεως. Phot.
Epi. 1.
This is in the
language of
Aristotle, τὸ
ποιῆσαι ἑτερον
ἐξ ἑνὸς αὐτὸ ζῶ-
ον μὲν ζῶον,
φύτιν δὲ φύτιν.
And S. B. l. 2.
contra Euno-
mium. πατὴρ
μὲν γὰρ ὄντι,
ὁ ἐτέρω τῷ
εἶναι κατὰ
τὴν ὁμοίαν
ἐκείνου φύσιν
τὴν ἀρχὴν παραχών.

† Etiam si filius hominis homo, in quibusdam simili-
in quibusdam tunc dissimilis patri; tamen quia ejusdem substantiæ est, negari verus
filius non potest, & quia verus est filius, negari ejusdem substantiæ non potest.
S. A. g. contra Maximin. c. 13. 2 Cor. 4. 4. Heb. 1. 3.

tinued. This then is the known * confession of all men, that a Son is nothing but another produced by his Father in the same nature with him. But God the Father hath communicated to the Word the same divine essence by which he is God; and consequently he is of the same nature with him, and thereby the perfect image and similitude of him, and therefore his proper Son. In humane generations we may conceive two kinds of similitude; one in respect of the internall nature, the other in reference to the externall form or figure. The former similitude is essentiall and necessary, it being impossible a man should beget a son, and that son not be by nature a man: the later accidentall, not onely sometimes the child representing this, sometime the other parent, but also oftentimes neither. † The similitude then in which the propriety of generation is preserved, is that which consisteth in the identity of nature: and this Communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word, is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude; from whence Christ is called *a the image of God, the brightnesse of his glory, and the expresse image of his person.*

Nor is this communication of the divine essence onely the proper generation of the Son, but we must acknowledge it farre more proper then any naturall generation of the Creature, not onely because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of nature is most perfect. As in the divine essence we acknowledge all the perfections of the creature, subtracting all the imperfections which adhere unto them here in things below; so in the communication, we must look upon the reality with-

out

out any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In humane generation the son is begotten in the same nature with the Father, which is performed by derivation, or decision of part of the substance of the parent: but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth a substance divisible, and consequently corporeall, whereas the essence of God is incorporeall, spirituall and indivisible; and therefore his nature is really communicated, not by derivation or decision, but by a totall and plenary communication. In naturall conceptions the Father necessarily precedeth the son, and begetteth one younger then himself: for being generation is for the perpetuity of the species, where the individualls successively fail, it is sufficient if the parent can produce another to live after him, and continue the existence of his nature, when his person is dissolved. But this presupposeth the imperfection of mortality, wholly to be removed when we speak of him who inhabiteth eternity: the essence which God alwayes had without beginning, without beginning he did communicate; being alwayes Father, as alwayes God. * Animals when they come to the perfection of nature, then become prolificall; in God eternall perfection sheweth his eternall fecundity. And that which is most remarkable, In humane generations the Son is of the same nature with the Father, and yet is not the same man; because though he hath an essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same essence: the power of generation depending on the first prolificall benediction, *increase and multiply*, it must be made by way of multiplication; and thus every son becomes another man. But the divine essence being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication; is so communicated as not to be multiplied; inasmuch that he

* πάντα δὲ
ὅσα ἦσαν τέ-
λεια γεννᾷ τὸ
δὲ αἰὶ τέλειον
αὐτὸ καὶ αἰδίον
γεννᾷ. Euseb.
de Prap. E-
vang. ex Ploti-
no. Ἀνθρώπων
μὲν γὰρ ἰδίον
τὸ ἐν χρόνῳ
γεννᾶν, διὰ τὸ
ἀτελές τῆς
φύσεως· θεῷ
δὲ αἰδίον τὸ
γέννημα, διὰ
τὸ αἰὶ τέλει-
ον τῆς φύσεως.

S. Athan. Orat. 2. This was it which so much troubled the Arrians, when they heard the Catholics constantly asserting, αἰὶ θεός, αἰὶ υἱός, ἅμα πατὴρ, ἅμα υἱός.

M m 2

which

which proceedeth by that communication hath not onely the same nature, but is also the same God. The Father God, and the Word God: *Abraham* man, and *Isaac* man: but *Abraham* one man, *Isaac* another man. Not so the Father one God, and the Word another; but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of generation is founded in the essentiall similitude of the son unto the father, by reason of the same nature which he receiveth from him; being the full perfect nature of God is communicated unto the Word, and that more intimately, and with a greater unity or identity then can be found in humane generations; it followeth that this communication of the divine nature is the proper generation, by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God. This was the foundation of S. Peter's Confession, *Thou art the Son of the living God*; this the ground of our Saviours † distinction, *I go unto my Father, and to your Father*. Hence did S. *John* raise a verity, more then onely a negation of falsity, when he said, *we are in the true Son*: for we which are in him are true, not false sons, but such sons we are not as *the true Son*. Hence did S. *Paul* draw an argument of the infinite love of God toward man, in that he *spared not his own proper son*. Thus have we sufficiently shewed, that the eternall communication of the divine essence by the Father to the Word, was a proper generation by which Christ Jesus alwayes was the true and proper Son of God: which was our fourth Assertion.

† Multum distat inter dominationem & conditionem, inter generationem & adoptionem, inter substantiam & gratiam. Ideoque hic non permixte nec pressim dicitur, Ascendo ad patrem nostrum, aut

Deum nostrum; sed ad Patrem meum, & Patrem vestrum, ad Deum meum, & ad Deum vestrum. Aliter enim illi Deus Pater est, aliter nobis. Illum siquidem natura coequat, misericordia humiliat: nos vero natura prostermit, misericordia erigit. *Capricolus Carthag. Epist.*

The fifth and last Assertion followeth, that the Divine essence was so peculiarly communicated to the Word, that there was never any other person naturally begotten by

by the Father, and in that respect Christ is the *Onely-begotten* Son of God. For the clearing of which truth, it will first be necessary to enquire into the true notion of the *Onely-begotten*; and then shew how it belongs particularly to Christ, by reason of the divine nature communicated by way of Generation to him alone. First therefore, we must avoid the vain interpretation of the ancient * Hereticks, who would have the restraining term (*onely*) to belong not to the Son, but to the Father; as if the *Onely-begotten* were no more then begotten of the Father onely. Which is both contrary to the language of the Scriptures, and the common custome of men, who use it not for him who is begotten of one, but for him who alone is begotten of any. Secondly, we must by no means admit the exposition of the † later Hereticks, who take the *Onely-begotten* to be nothing else but the most beloved of all the sons; because *Isaac* was called the onely son of *Abraham*, when we know that he had *Ishmael* beside, and *Solomon*

* This was the fallacy which Eutomius endeavoured to put upon the church, as appears by those words of his delivered and answered by S. Basil; Διὰ τὸ το γὰρ, φησὶ, μονογενὴς, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ μόνου τῆ τῆ ἀγεννήτου

δυνάμει γεννηθεὶς καὶ κληθεὶς τελειότατος γέγονεν ἑαυτοῦ. As if μονογενὴς were onely παρὰ μόνου, and unigenitus were nothing else but genitus ab uno. This S. Basil refuteth copiously: First, from the language of the Scriptures and the usage of mankind; διὰ τὴν πανουργίαν, ἣν περὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῷ μονογενεὶ ἀνακέρυνται, παρὰ τε τὴν ἡ ἀνθρώπων συνήθειαν, καὶ παρὰ τὴν εὐσεβῆ ἡ γερῶν παρόδον λαμβάνων αὐτῇ τὴν διάνοιαν. Μονογενὴς γὰρ ἔχ' ὁ παρὰ μόνου γενόμενος, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνος γεννηθεὶς ἐν τῇ κοινῇ χρήσει παραπορεύεται. Secondly, by a retort peculiar to that Heresy, which held the Son of God might be called κληθεὶς as well as γεννηθεὶς, created as well as begotten, and consequently might be as properly named μονόκτιστος as μονογενὴς. Εἰ μὴ παρὰ τὸ μόνον γεννητὸς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ παρὰ μόνου μονογενὴς εἴρηται, ταυτὸ δὲ ὅτι κατὰ σὲ τὸ ἐκπύδης τὸ γεννητὸς, πῶς καὶ Μονόκτιστον αὐτὸν ὀνομάζεις; Thirdly, by a particular instance shewing the absurdity of such an interpretation, for that thereby no man could properly be call'd μονογενὴς, because not begotten of one, but two parents. Μονογενὴς δὲ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀνθρώπων ἑδείξεται κατὰ τὸν ὑμέτερον λόγον, διὰ τὸ ἐκ συνουσίας πάντων ἀρχῶν τὴν γέννησιν. Ἐδὲ ἡ Σάρρα μήτηρ μονογενεὶς ἦν παιδὶς, διότι ἔχ' ὁ μόνος αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆ Ἀβελίαν ἐτεκνώσατο. † The Socinians make very much of this Notion, and apply it so unto Christ, as that thereby they might avoid all necessity of an eternall generation. So the Racovian Catechisme: Causa cur Christo ista attributa (sc. proprium & unigenitum Dei Filium esse) com-

petant, hæc est; quod inter omnes Dei filios & præcipuus sit, & Deo charissimus quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus, & hæc est extitit, unigenitus vocatus est, Heb. 11. 17. licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit; & Solomon unigenitus eorum matre sua, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint. 1 Paral. 3. 1, 2, 3, &c. And that this might be applied to the interpretation of the Creed, Schellingius hath inserted it as a material observation; Nam hic unicus seu unigena filius nominatur, qui cæteris longe charior est Patri, longeque præstantior; and confirms the Interpretation with those two testimonies concerning Isaac and Solomon. But certainly this Observation of theirs is vain, or what else they say is false. For if Christ be called the Son of God, because conceived by the Holy Ghost, and none else was ever so conceived, then is he the onely-begotten by virtue of his generation. And if so, then is he not the onely-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, that is, by the affection and prelation of their Parents. Or if Christ were the Onely-begotten as Isaac and Solomon were, then was he not conceived after a singular manner, for the brethren of Solomon no way differed from him in their generation. It is plain therefore that this Interpretation was invented, that, when all the rest should fail, they might stick to this.

said to be the onely-begotten before his Mother, when David had other children even by the Mother of Solomon. For the onely-begotten and the most beloved are not the same, the one having the nature of a cause in respect of the other; and the same cannot be cause and effect to it self. For though it be true, that the onely son is the beloved son, yet with this order, that he is therefore beloved because the onely, not therefore the onely because beloved. Although therefore Christ be the Onely-begotten and the beloved Son of God, yet we must not look upon these two attributes as synonymous, or equally significant of the same thing, but as one depending on the other, his unigeniture being the foundation of his singular love. Avoiding therefore these two expositions, as farre short of the true notion of the onely-begotten, we must look upon it in the most proper, full, and significant sense, as signifying a Son so begotten as none other is, was, or can be: so as the term restrictive *onely* shall have relation not only to the * Father generating, but also to the Son begotten,

* Eunomius
would have it
onely $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$

$\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in relation to the Father onely. S. Basil shews that no way proper, and shews that $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is not he which $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, but $\mu\acute{o}\nu\theta\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. S. Cyril adds
and

these two $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\mu\acute{o}\nu\upsilon\varsigma$ and $\mu\acute{o}\nu\Theta$ together, in relation to the Father and the Son. *Μονογενὴς κατὰ φύσιν, ὁ ἐκ θεῦ πατρὸς ἀνόμασται λόγος, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου γέννηται τῷ πατρὶ.* Epist. 1. ad Regim. as Ruffinus doth in Unicus. Ideo subiungit Unicum hunc esse Filium Dei, Unus enim de uno nascitur. *Expos. Symb.* S. Gregory Naz. addes to these two a third, in respect of the manner. *Μονογενὴς δὲ, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου καὶ μόνου, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ μονοτρόπως, ὡς τὰ ζῷα.* So be something obscurely and corruptly, but plainly enough in Damascene, who aims often to deliver himself in the words of Nazianzen. *Λέγεται μονογενὴς, ὅτι μόνος ἐκ μόνου τῷ πατρὶ μόνως ἐγεννήθη. ἔστι δὲ ὁμοίον εἰς τὴν γέννησιν τῷ θεῷ.*

and to the manner of the generation. 'Tis true, the Father spake from heaven saying, *thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased:* and thereby we are to understand, that whosoever of us are beloved by the Father, are so beloved in and through the Son. In the same manner Christ is the *Onely-begotten* Son of God; and as many of us as God hath bestowed his love upon, that we should be called the sons of God, are all brought into that near relation by our fellowship with him, who is by a farre more near relation the naturall and eternall Son.

Having thus cleared the interpretation of the word, that properly, as primogeniture consisteth in prelation, so unigeniture in exclusion; and that none can be strictly called the *Onely-begotten*, but he who alone was so begotten; we shall proceed to make good our Assertion, shewing that the divine essence was peculiarly communicated to the Word, by which he was begotten the Son of God, and never any was so begotten beside that Son.

And here we meet with two difficulties: one shewing there were other sons of God said to be begotten of him, to whom either the divine essence was communicated, and then the communication of that to the Word made him not the *Onely-begotten*; or it was not communicated, and then there is no such communication necessary to found such a filiation: the other alledging that the same divine essence may be communicated to another beside the

the Word, and not onely that it may, but that it is so, to the Person of the Holy Ghost: whence either the Holy Ghost must be the Son of God, and then the Word is not the onely-begotten; or if he be not the Son, then is not the communication of the divine essence a sufficient foundation of the relation of Sonship. These two objections being answered, nothing will remain farther to demonstrate this last assertion.

For the first, we acknowledge that others are frequently called the sons of God, and that we call the same God our Father which Christ called his; that both he that san-

Heb. 2. 11.

1 Cor. 4. 15.

ὁ ὃς Χεῖρ

Ἰησοῦ διὰ τῆς

ἐναγγελίης

ἐργαζομένης

ἐν ὑμῖν.

1 Joh. 3. 9.

πᾶς ὁ γεννη-

μένος ἐκ τῆς

Θεοῦ ἀμαρτίαν

ὅτι ποιεῖ, ὅτι

σπέρμα αὐτοῦ

ἐν αὐτῷ μέ-

νει. And more

expressly 1 Joh.

5. 1. Πᾶς ὁ

πιστεύων ὅτι

Ἰησοῦς ὅστις ὁ

Χεῖρς, ἐκ τῆς

Θεοῦ γεννηθείς

αὐτῆς.

Quisquis credit

Jesum esse Christum

illum, ex Deo

genitus est;

& quisquis

diligit eum qui genuit,

diligit etiam eum qui ex eo

genitus est.

† Nos genuit

Deus, ut filii ejus simus,

quos fecerat ut homines

essemus. Unicum autem genuit,

non solum ut Filius esset,

quod Pater non est,

sed etiam ut Deus esset,

quod & Pater

est. S. Aug. de Conf. Evangel. l. 2. c. 3.

* First, it is most certain that the

Word of God, as the Word, is not the adopted, but the naturall Son of God. Non est

Dei Filius Deus falsus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus nuncupativus, sed Deus verus.

ion

ctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause he is not ashamed to call us breithren: we confesse that those whom S. Paul hath begotten through the Gospel, may well be term'd the begotten of God, whose seed remaineth in them: but withall we affirm that this our regeneration is of a nature wholly different from the Generation of the Son. We are first † generated, and have our naturall being; after that regenerated, and so receive a spirituall renovation, and by vertue thereof an inheritance incorruptible: whereas the Generation of Christ admits no regeneration, he becoming at once thereby God, and Son, and Heir of all. The state of sonship which we come into is but of Adoption, shewing the generation by which we are begotten to be but metaphoricall: whereas Christ is so truly begotten, so properly the naturall Son of God, that his * generation clearly excludeth the name of Adoption; and not onely so, but when he becometh the

θεῦ γεννηθείς καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν γεννηθέντα ὁ ἀγαπᾷ. Quisquis credit Jesum esse Christum illum, ex Deo genitus est; & quisquis diligit eum qui genuit, diligit etiam eum qui ex eo genitus est.

† Nos genuit Deus, ut filii ejus simus, quos fecerat ut homines essemus. Unicum autem genuit, non solum ut Filius esset, quod Pater non est, sed etiam ut Deus esset, quod & Pater est. S. Aug. de Conf. Evangel. l. 2. c. 3.

* First, it is most certain that the Word of God, as the Word, is not the adopted, but the naturall Son of God. Non est

Dei Filius Deus falsus, nec Deus adoptivus, nec Deus nuncupativus, sed Deus verus.

ion

S. Hil. de Trin. l. 5. Hic etiam Filius Dei natura est Filius, non adoptione. Concil. Toleta. 11. Τίς τῷ θεῷ ὁτι φύσις, καὶ ὁ θεὸς γεννηθὴς ἐκ πατρὸς. S. Cyril. Hierosoly. Catech. 1. and again, Οὐκ ἐκ τῷ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν παρῆλθεν, ὡς τὸν μὴ ὄντα εἰς ὑπόστασις ἦρχαν ἀλλ' αἰδιος ὢν ὁ πατὴρ, αἰδιος ἐγένετο καὶ ἀνεκφράστως υἱὸν εἶνα μόνον, ἀδελφὸν ἐκ ἕχοντα. This hath been so generally confessed, that Felix and Eupandus, who were condemned for maintaining Christ as man to be the adopted Son of God, and acknowledged it; as appeareth by the beginning of their Book. Confitemur & credimus Deum, Dei Filium, ante omnia tempora sine initio ex Patre genitum, coeternum & consubstantialem, non adoptione, sed genere. Secondly, it is also certain, that the Man Christ Jesus taken personally, is the naturall, not the adopted Son of God: because the man Christ Jesus is no other person then the Word, who is the eternall and naturall Son, and by subsisting in the humane nature could not leave off to be the naturall Son. The deniall of this by Felix and Eupandus was condemned as Hereticall in the Council of Frankford; and their Opinion was thus expressed, partly in the words of S. Augustine, partly in their own additions. Confitemur & credimus eum factum ex muliere, factum sub lege, non genere esse filium Dei, sed adoptione, non natura, sed gratis. This they maintained by forged Testimonies of some Fathers, and by the Liturgy of the Church of Toledo, composed by Hildephonius, as the Roman by Gregory. In the Masse de Cœna Domini, Qui per adoptivi hominis passionem, cum suo non indulsit corpori. And in the Masse de Ascensione Domini, Hodie Salvator noster per adoptionem carnis, sedem repetivit Deitatis. To this the Synod opposed their determination in Sacrosyllabo. Quod ex te nascetur sanctum vocabitur filius Dei, non adoptivus, sed verus, non alienus, sed proprius. And again, Porro adoptivus dici non potest, nisi is qui alienus est ab eo à quo dicitur adoptatus: & gratis ei adoptio tribuitur, quoniam non ex debito, sed ex indulgentia tantummodo adoptio præstatur: sicut nos aliquando cum essemus peccando filii iræ, alieni eramus à Deo, per proprium & verum Filium qui non eguit adoptione, adoptio nobis filiorum donata est. And of this they give us the true ground in the Synodic Epistle. Unitas personæ quæ est in Dei filio & filio Virginis, adoptionis tollit injuriam.

son of man, even in his humanity refuseth the name of an adopted son. For when the fulnesse of time was come, Gal. 4. 4. 5. God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, (not that he, but) that we might receive the adoption of sons. He then whose generation is totally different from ours whom he calleth brethren, he whom in the sacred Scriptures the spirit nameth the true Son, the Father sometimes his own,

N

some-

* Legi & re-
gi Scripturas,
Jesum filium
Dei nusquam
adoptione in-
veni. *Ambro-
faster* Com. in
Ep. ad Rom. Di-
ces mihi, Cur
times adopti-
vum Christum
Dominum no-
minare? Dico
tibi, quia nec
Apostoli eum
sic nominar-
unt, nec san-
cta Eccl. & Ca-
tholica Ecclie
consuetudi-
nem habuit sic
eum appellare.
Synod. Epist.

Council. Francoford. From whence they charge all those to whom they write that Synodical Epistle, that they should be satisfied with such expressions as they found in the Scriptures. Intelligite, Fratres, quæ legitis, & nolite nova & incognita nomina fingere, sed quæ in S. Scriptura inveniuntur, tenere, &c.

† S. Aug. hath observed, that S. Paul made use of *υιοθεσια*, that he might distinguish the filiation of Christ from ours. At vero etiam nos, quibus dedit Deus potestatem filios ejus fieri, de natura atque substantia sua non nos genuit, sicut unicum Filium, sed utique dilectione adoptavit. Quo verbo Apostolus sæpe uti non ob aliud intelligitur, nisi ad discernendum Unigenitum. I. e. Consens. *Evang. l. 2. c. 3.* And S. Ambrose takes notice, that the name of true destroyeth that of adopted. Adoptivum filium non dicimus filium esse natura, sed eum dicimus natura esse filium, qui verus est filius. De Incarn. Sac. c. 8.

¶ Si unicus, quomodo adoptivus, dum multi sunt adoptivi filii? Unicus itaque de multis non potest dici. *Council. Francof.* Quod si etiam Unigenitus Filius factus dicitur ex gratia, non vere genitus ex natura, proculdubio nomen & veritatem Unigeniti perdidit, postquam fratres habere jam coepit; privatur enim hujus veritatis nominis, si in Unigenito non est de Patre veritas naturalis. *Fulgentius ad Thrasim. l. 3. c. 3.* Si divina illa Filii sempiternaque nativitas, non de natura Dei Patris, sed ex gratia creditur substituisse, non debet Unigenitus vocari, sed tantummodo genitus. Quoniam sicut ei nomen geniti largitas adoptionis paternæ contribuit, sic

But

sometimes his beloved, but * never his adopted Son, he who by those proper and peculiar appellations is † distinguished from us, who can claim no higher filiation then that which we receive by the priviledge of adoption, he is truly the Onely-begotten Son of God; notwithstanding the same God hath begotten us by his Word: and the reason why he is so, is, because the divine essence was communicated unto him in his naturall and eternall generation, whereas onely the grace of God is conveyed unto us in our Adoption. Indeed, if we were begotten of the substance of God, as Christ was, or he were onely by the grace of God ‖ adopted, as we are, then could he by no propriety of speech be called the Onely Son, by reason of so many brethren: but being we cannot aspire unto the first, nor he descend unto the later, it remaineth, we acknowledge him, notwithstanding the first difficulty, by vertue of his naturall and peculiar generation, to be the *Onely-begotten Son.*

um ab Unigeniti nomine nobis quoque tributa communio paternæ adoptionis exclusit. Unigenitus enim non vocatur, quamvis genitus possit vocari, cum genitis. *Ib. c. 4.*

But though neither men nor Angels be begotten of the substance of God, or by vertue of any such naturall generation be called sons; yet one person we know, to whom the divine essence is as truly and really communicated by the Father, as to the Son, which is the third person in the blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. Why then should the Word, by that communication of the divine essence, become the Son, and not the Holy Ghost by the same? or if, by receiving the same nature, he also be the Son of God, how is the Word the only Son? To this I answer, that the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence from the Father, which the Word receiveth, and thereby becometh the same God with the Father and the Word: but though the essence be the same which is communicated, yet there is a difference in the communication; the Word being God by generation, the Holy Ghost by procession: and though every thing which is begotten proceedeth, yet every thing which proceedeth is not begotten. Wherefore, in the language of the sacred Scriptures and the Church, the Holy Ghost is never said to be begotten, but to proceed from the Father; nor is he ever call'd the Son, but the gift of God. *Eve* was produced out of *Adam*, and in the same nature

* Non omne id quod procedit, nascitur, licet omne id quod nascitur procedat.

S. Aug. contra Max. l. 3. c. 14.

who gives the same solution to the same Argument. Quæris à me, si de substantia Patris est Filius, de substantia Patris est etiam Spiritus Sanctus, cur unus filius sit, & alius non sit filius? Ego respondeo, sive capias, sive non capias; De Patre est Filius, de Patre est Spiritus S. sed ille genitus est, iste procedens. † Nunquam fuit non Pater, à quo Filius natus, à quo Spiritus Sanctus non natus, quia non est filius. *Gennad. De Eccles. Dogm.* Deus Pater innascibilis non ex aliquo, Deus Filius unigenitus ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre, Spiritus S. innascibilis ex aliquo, hoc est, ex Patre. *Isaac. lib. Fidei.* Quod neque natum neque factum est, Spiritus S. est, qui à Patre & Filio procedit. *S. Ambr. in Symb.*

with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of *Adam*; whereas *Seth* proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the Son of *Adam*: and this difference was not in the nature produced, but in the manner of production; *Eve* descending not from *Adam*, as *Seth* did, by way of generation, that is, by naturall fecundity. The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father in the same nature with him, the Word proceedeth from the same Person in the same similitude of nature also; but the Word proceeding is the Son, the Holy Ghost is not, because the first procession is by way of generation, the other is not. As therefore the Regeneration and Adoption of man, so the procession of the Holy Ghost doth no way prejudice the eternall generation, as pertaining solely to the Son of God.

Seeing then our Saviour Jesus Christ had a reall being and existence before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*; seeing the being which he had antecedently to that conception, was not any created, but the one and indivisible divine essence; seeing he had not that divinity of himself originally, as the Father, but by communication from him; seeing the communication of the same essence unto him was a proper generation; we cannot but believe that the same Jesus Christ is the begotten Son of God: and seeing the same essence was never so by way of generation communicated unto any, we must also acknowledge him the *Only-begotten*, distinguished from the Holy Ghost, as Son, from the Adopted children, as the Naturall Son.

The necessity of the belief of this part of the Article, that Jesus Christ is the proper and naturall Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, and by that singular way of generation, the *Only Son*, appeareth first in the confirmation of our Faith concerning the Redemption of mankind. For this doth shew such an excellency and dignitie in the person of the Mediatour, as will assure us of an
infinite

infinite efficacy in his actions, and value in his sufferings. We know *it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins*: and we may very well doubt, how the blood of him who hath no other nature then that of man, can take away the sins of other men; there appearing no such difference as will shew a certainty in the one, and an impossibility in the other. But since we may be *bought with a price*, well may we believe the blood of Christ sufficiently *precious*, when we are assured that it is the *blood of God*: nor can we question the efficacy of it in purging *our conscience from dead works*, if we believe Christ *offered up himself through the eternall Spirit*. If we be truly sensible of our sins, we must acknowledge that in every one we have offended God; and the gravity of every offence must needs increase proportionably to the dignity of the part offended in respect of the offender, because the more worthy any person is, the more reverence is due unto him, and every injury tendeth to his dishonour: but between God and man there is an infinite disproportion, and therefore every offence committed against him, must be esteemed as in the highest degree of injury. Again, as the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended, so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying, because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injury was eclipsed; and all honour doth encrease proportionably as the person yielding it is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated; how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation, be of the same infinite dignity, so as the honour rendred by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence, and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied, then by a belief in such a Mediatour as is the Only-begotten Son

Heb. 10. 4.

1 Cor. 6. 20.

7. 23.

1 Pet. 1. 19.

Act. 20. 28.

Heb. 9. 14.

of God, of the same substance with the Father, and consequently of the power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended.

Secondly, The belief of the eternall generation of the Son, by which he is the same God with the Father, is necessary for the confirming and encouraging a Christian, in ascribing that honour and glory unto Christ, which is due unto him. For we are commanded to give that worship unto the Son, which is truly and properly divine; the same which we give unto God the Father, who *hath committed all judgement unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* As it was represented to S. John in a vision, when he *heard every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, saying, Blessing honour, glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lambe, for ever and ever.*

Again, we are commanded *to fear the Lord our God, and to serve him;* and that with such an emphasis, as by him we are to understand him alone, because *the Lord our God is one Lord.* From whence, if any one arose among the *Jewes*, teaching under the title of a Prophet to worship any other beside him for God, the judgement of the * Rabbins was, that notwithstanding all the miracles which he could work, though they were as great as *Moses* wrought, he ought immediately to be strangled, because the evidence of this truth, that One God onely must be worshipt, is above all evidence of sense. Nor must we look upon this precept as valid onely under the Law, as if then there were onely one God to be worshipt, but since the Gospel we had another; for our Saviour hath commended it to our observation, by making use of it against the Devil in his temptation, saying, *a get thee hence Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him onely shalt thou serve.* If then we be obliged to worship the God of Israel onely; if we be also commanded to give

Job. 5. 23.

Rev. 5. 13.

Deut. 6. 13, 4.

† The emphasis appears in this, that it is not barely

וְיָעֲבֹד, & serves ei,

וְיָעֲבֹד, & ipse serves, with

such a peculiar restriction as is expressed by

the LXX. &

αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

and approved by our Saviour,

Matt. 4. 10.

* Moses Maïm. Praeit. in

Seder Zeraïm.

a Matt. 4. 10.

give the same worship to the Son, which we give to him ; it is necessary that we should believe that the Son is the God of *Israel*. When the Scripture *bringeth in the first begotten into the world, it saith, Let all the Angels of God worship him ;* but then the same Scripture calleth that first begotten *Jehovah, and the Lord of the whole earth.* Heb. 1. 6. Psal. 97. 6, 7. For a man to worship that for God which is not God, knowing that it is not God, is affected and grosse Idolatry ; to worship that as God which is not God, thinking that it is God, is not in the same degree, but the same sin ; to worship him as God, who is God, thinking that he is not God, cannot be thought an act in the formality void of Idolatry. Lest therefore, while we give unto the Son of God that divine honour which we are all oblig'd to give unto him, we should fall into that sin which of all others we ought most to abhorre, it is no lesse then necessary, that we should believe that Son to be that eternall God, whom we are bound to worship, and whom onely we should serve.

Thirdly, our belief in Christ, as the eternall Son of God, is necessary to raise us unto a thankfull acknowledgement of the infinite love of God appearing in the sending of his onely begotten Son into the world to die for sinners. This love of God is frequently extoll'd and admired by the Apostles. *God so loved the world, saith S. John, that he gave his onely-begotten Son. God commendeth his love towards us, saith S. Paul, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us ; in that he spared not his own Son. but delivered him up for us all.* Jo. 3. 16. Rom. 5, 8. 8, 32. In this, saith S. John again, *was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his onely-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* 1 Joh. 4. 9, 10. If we look upon all this as nothing else, but that God should cause a man to be born after another manner then other men, and when he was so born after a peculiar

liar manner, yet a mortall man, should deliver him to die for the sins of the world; I see no such great expresseion of his love in this way of redemption, more then would have appeared if he had redeemed us any other way. 'Tis true indeed that the reparation of lapsed man, is no act of absolute necessity in respect of God, but that he hath as freely designed our redemption as our creation; and considering the misery from which we are redeemed, and the happinesse to which we are invited, we cannot but acknowledge the singular love of God even in the act of Redemption it self: but yet the Apostles have rais'd that consideration higher, and placed the choicest mark of the love of God, in the chusing such means, and performing in that manner our reparation; by sending his *only-begotten* into the world; by not sparing his own Son; by giving and delivering him up to be scourged and crucified for us: and the estimation of this act of Gods love must necessarily increase proportionably to the dignity of the Son so sent into the world; because the more worthy the person of Christ before he suffered, the greater his condescension to such a suffering condition, and the nearer his relation to the Father, the greater his love to us for whose sakes he sent him so to suffer. Wherefore to derogate any way from the dignity of the Person and nature of our Saviour before he suffered, is so farre to undervalue the love of God, and consequently, to come short of that acknowledgement and thanksgiving which is due unto him for it. If then the sending of Christ into the world, were the highest act of the love of God which could be expressed; if we be obliged unto a return of thankfulnesse some way correspondent to such infinite love; if such a return can never be made without a true sense of that infinity, and a sense of that infinity of love cannot consist without an apprehension of an infinite dignity of nature in the person sent; then is it absolutely necessary to believe that Christ is so the *only-begotten* Son of the Father, as to be

be of the same substance with him, of glory equal, of Majesty coeternall.

By this discourse in way of explication, every Christian may understand what it is he sayes, and expresse his mind how he would be understood when he maketh this brief confession, I believe in Christ *the onely Son* of God. For by these words he must be thought to intend no lesse then this: I do professe to be fully assured of this Assertion, as of a most certain, infallible, and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ the Saviour and Messias is the true, proper, and naturall Son of God, begotten of the substance of the Father, which being incapable of division or multiplication, is so really and totally communicated to him, that he is of the same essence with him, God of God, light of light, very God of very God. And as I assert him so to be the Son, so do I also exclude all other persons from that Sonship, acknowledging none but him to be begotten of God by that proper and naturall generation, and thereby excluding all which are not begotten, as it is a generation; all which are said to be begotten, and are called sons, but are so onely by adoption, as 'tis naturall. And thus I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his *Onely Son*.

O U R L O R D.

AFTER our Saviour's Relation founded upon his eternall generation followeth his Dominion, as the necessary consequent of his Filiation. For as we believe him to be the Son of God, so must we acknowledge him to be *our Lord*, because the onely Son must of necessity be Heir and Lord of all in his Father's house, and all others which bear the name of sons, whether they be men or Angels, if compar'd to him, must not be look'd upon as sons of God, but as seryants of Christ.

the Samaritan woman saw him alone at the well, and knew no more of him then that he appeared to be one of the Jewes, she said, Κύριε, ἀνταρῆμα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φησὶς ἐστὶ βαδύ. Jo. 4. 11. And the infirm man at the pool of Bethesda, when he mist not who it was, said unto him, Κύριε, ἀνδραπόδον ἔχεις. Joh. 5. 7. The blind man to whom he had restored his sight, with the same salutation maketh confession of his ignorance, and his faith, Τίς δὲ Κύριε; and μετὼν Κύριε, Joh. 9. 36, 38.

1 Cor. 8. 5, 6.

Eph. 4. 5.

Coloss. 3. 22.

1 Cor. 2. 8.

15, 47.

a Rev. 10. 6.

so, there are many Lords, but he is in that notion Lord, which admits of no more then one. They are only masters according to the flesh, he the Lord of glory, the Lord from heav'n, a King of Kings, and Lord of all other Lords.

Nor is it difficult to find that name amongst the books of the Law in the most high and full signification, for it is most frequently used as the name of the supreme God, sometimes for *El* or *Elohim*, sometimes for *Shaddai* or the *Rock*, often for *Adonai*, and most universally for *Jehovah*, the undoubted proper name of God, and that to which the Greek Translatours long before our Saviour's birth, had most appropriated the name of *Lord*, not only by way of explication, but distinction & particular expression. As we read, *thou whose name alone is Jehovah; art the most high over all the earth*, & when God so expresth himself, *I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them*. In both these places, for the name *Jehovah*, the Greek Translation which the Apostles followed, hath no other name but *Lord*; and therefore undoubtedly by that word which we translate *the Lord*, did they understand the proper name of God, *Jehovah*, and had they placed it there as the exposition of any other name of

Pf. 83. 18.

Ex. 6. 3.

† I know it is the vulgar opinion that κύριος is properly answered unto

יהוה, and the reason why it was also used for יהוה is no other then because the Jewes were wont to read *Adonai* in the place of *Jehovah*. Of which observation they make great use who deny the Divinity of Christ. Quia enim *Adonai* pro *Jehovah* in lectione Hebraeorum verborum substitui consuevit, ideo illius etiam interpretatio huic accommodatur, says Crellius de Deo & Act. c. 14. But first it is not probable that the LXX should think κύριος to be the proper interpretation of יהוה, and give it to *Jehovah* only in the place of *Adonai*; for if they had, it would have followed,

God,

pretation of no other name can make good that expression: and therefore we have reason to believe the word which the first Greek Translatours, and after them the Apostles used, may be appropriated to that notion which the Originall requires; as indeed it may, being derived from a verb of the same signification with the † Hebrew root, and so denoting the essence or existence of God, and whatsoever else may be deduc'd from thence, as revealed by him to be signified thereby.

† It is acknowledged by all that יהוה is from יהי or יהי , and God's own in-

terpretation proves no lesse יהוה יונה יהוה Ex. 3. 14. and though some contend, the futurition is essential to the name, yet all agree the root signifieth nothing but essence or existence, that is, ἐἶναι , or ὑπάρχειν . Now as from יהי in the Hebrew יהי , so in the Greek ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπάρχειν . And what the proper signification of ὑπάρχειν is, no man can teach us better then Helychius, in whom we read $\text{ἔσθι, ὑπάρχει, πυρρῶς}$. Hence was ὑπάρχει by the Atticks used for ἔσθι fit; so I take it from the words of the Scholiast upon Sophocles; $\text{τὸ κυρῶ φησὶ πομπήνως φησὶν ἰκανοῖα καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὡς δὲ εὐκτακῶς βαρύνουσιν αὐτὸ Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ βουλῆς φησὶ, ὑπάρχει ἀλγόντως ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπάρχειν}$. Not that they used it by an apocope, taking it from ὑπάρχειν , but that ὑπάρχει was taken in the sense of ὑπάρχειν or ὑπάρχειν from ὑπάρχειν , ὑπάρχει , ἔσθι or ὑπάρχει . Neither know I better how to render ὑπάρχει then by ὑπάρχεις in that place of Aeschylus his Prometheus,

$\text{Ζηλῶ σ' ὅθ' ἔσθ' αὐτὸς αἰτιάει ὑπάρχεις, Πάριον μεταρῶν καὶ τετολμηκῶς ἐμεί}$.

As the Arundelian Scholiast upon the Septem Thebana ὑπάρχει, ὑπάρχει , and in the same Tragedy $\text{ἔσθ' ἀσπίδος ὑπάρχει}$, is rendered by the more ancient Scholiast, ἔσθ' ἀσπίδος ; as in the Persa, $\text{ὀντασμένως ὑπάρχει}$, is by the same Interpreter explained $\text{ὑπάρχει καὶ ὑπάρχει σπουδαμένως}$. And no other sense can be imagined of that word in Sophocles, $\text{φονία. σὺ φημὶ τανδρὸς ἔσθ' ὑπάρχεις ὑπάρχει}$, then by rendering it ἔσθ' or ὑπάρχεις ; or of that in Euripides his Phœnixia,

$\text{αἰὲν, τίς ἐσὶ πύλαισι δαμνάντων ὑπάρχει}$

This originall interpretation appeareth farther in the frequent use of ὑπάρχει for πυρρῶς as it signifieth no more then sum; as in Sophocles ἐσθ' ὑπάρχει for ἐσθ' ὑπάρχει ; μὲν ὑπάρχει for μὲν ὑπάρχει ; ἐπὶ ὑπάρχει for ἐπὶ ὑπάρχει ; ὡς ὑπάρχει for ὡς ὑπάρχει ; ὑπάρχει for ὑπάρχει ; ἐπὶ ὑπάρχει for ἐπὶ ὑπάρχει ; and in Euripides ὑπάρχει for ὑπάρχει ; ὑπάρχει for ὑπάρχει ; ὑπάρχει for ὑπάρχει ; or ὑπάρχει as the Scholiast. From all which it undeniably appeareth, that the ancient signification of ὑπάρχει or ὑπάρχει is the same with ἐἶναι or ὑπάρχει , sum, I am. and therefore ὑπάρχει immediately derived from thence must be ὅς ὢν , or ὅς ὑπάρχει ; and consequently the proper interpretation of יהוה descending from the root יהי of the same signification. And well may we conceive the LXX for this reason to have so translated it, because we find the origination delivered by them in that notion, rendering יהוה ὅς ὢν Ex. 3.

Being

14. ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Ὄν, and again, ὁ Ὄν ἀπὸ ἀλλή με παρὲς ὑμᾶς. From whence considering the name *יהוה* proceeding from that root, and given in relation to that sense, they made use of the word *κύριος* for the standing interpretation of that name, as being equivalent to ὁ Ὄν. we have no reason then to conceive either that they so translated it out of the superstition of the Jewes, (as some would persuade us, whom we have already refuted) or because they had no letters in the Greek language by which they could expresse the Hebrew name, whereas we find it often expressed even among the Gentile Greeks; but because they thought the Greek *κύριος* to be a proper interpretation, because reducible to the same signification. For even they which are pretended to have read Adonai for Jehovah, as Origen, &c. do acknowledge that the Heathens and the ancient Hereticks descending from the Jewes, had a name by which they did expresse the Hebrew Jehovah. We know that Oracles preserved by Macrobius, Saturnal. l. 1. c. 28. φησὶ τοὺς πάλαιον ὑπάρχον θεὸν ἑμμεν *Ἰαώ*. and Diodorus hath taught us from whence that name first came, mentioning Moses in this manner, *παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις Μωσῆν τὸν Ἰαὼ ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν.* and Theodoret more expressly, Quæst. 15. in Exod. *Καλεῖται δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαριτῶν μὲν Ἰαὼ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἰαὼ.* Porphyr. l. 4. contra Christian. tells us Sanchoniathon had his relations of the Jewes *παρὰ Ἰερεμβάβη τῷ Ἰσραὴλ θεῷ, τῷ Ἰαὼ.* Eusebius (as we formerly mentioned) said *Ἰωσὴς ὄντιν Ἰαὼ οὐτνελα.* Hesychius, *Ἰαὼ δαμ ἰαὼ λωτέλεια,* taking *ια* in composition for the contraction of *ιαώ*. As *Ἰαὼ* ἐρμηνεύεται ὑψίστου πονύριος. and the LXX Jer. 23. 6. have rendred *יהוה יחזק* *Ἰωσὴδ ἐκ,* id est Dominus iustus, saith S. Hierome. And as the Heathens and the first Christians, so the Hereticks had among them the pronunciation and expression of the name *יהוה*. As the Valentinian was baptized *ὁ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰαὼ.* Iren. l. 1. and the Ophiani had their severall Gods among the rest, *ἀπὸ μὲν μαγείας τὸν Ἰαλδαβαὼθ, καὶ τὸν ἀσφαῖον, καὶ τὸν ὤεαῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἐβραϊκῶν γεγραπὸν τὸν Ἰαὼ Ἰαὼ παρ' Ἐβραίοις ὀνομαζόμενον.* Orig. contra Cellsum. l. 6. So I read it, not as it is in the Edition of Hæschelius, *Ἰαὼ* is one word, or *ἰαὼῦα*, as our learned Countryman Nicolaus Fullerus hath endeavoured in vain to rectifie it, but *ἰαὼ ἰα*, that is, the Ophiani took the name *Ἰαὼ* from the Jewes, among whom it signifies the same who is called *Iah*. For that it ought so to be read, appeareth by the former words of Origen, *Οἰονταὶ τὸν διαλόντα τὸν Ἰαλδαβαὼθ καὶ φθασάντα ὅτι τὸν Ἰαὼ δεῖν λέγειν, Σὺ δὲ κρυπτομένων μυστικῶν ἢ καὶ παλαιοῦ ἀρχῶν νυκτοφανὲς διότι τὸν Ἰαὼ.* In the printed Copy indeed it is *ἰαὼ δὲν*, and in the Latine Iadin, but without sense; but dividing the words, the sense is manifest, and the reason of the former emendation apparent. Being then that there were so many among the Greeks which did in all ages expresse the Hebrew name, it can be no way probable that the LXX should avoid it as inexpressible in their language.

Being then this Title *Lord* thus signifieth the proper name of God Jehovah, being the same is certainly attributed unto Christ, in a notion farre surpassing all other Lords,

Lords, which are rather to be looked upon as servants unto him, it will be worth our enquiry next whether, as it is the Translation of the name *Iehovah*, it belong to Christ; or whether, though he be Lord of all other Lords, as subjected under his authority, yet he be so inferiour unto him whose name alone is *Iehovah*, as that in that propriety and eminency in which it belongs unto the supreme God, it may not be attributed unto Christ.

This doubt will easily be satisfied, if we can shew the name *Iehovah* it self to be given unto our Saviour; it being against all reason to acknowledge the originall name, and to deny the interpretation in the sense and full importance of that originall. Wherefore if Christ be the *Jehovah*, as so called by the Spirit of God, then is he so the Lord, in the same propriety and eminency in which *Jehovah* is. Now whatsoever did belong to the *Messias*, that may and must be attributed unto Jesus, as being the true and onely Christ. But the *Jewes* themselves acknowledge that *Jehovah* shall be known clearly in the dayes of the *Messias*, and not only so, but that it is the * name which properly belongeth to him. And if they cannot but confesse so much, who only read the prophecies as the Eunuch did, without an interpreter; how can we be ignorant of so plain and necessary a truth, whose eyes have seen the full completion, and read the infallible interpretation of them? If they could see *Iehovah*, the Lord of hosts to be the name of the *Messias*, who was to them for a

stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, how can we possibly be ignorant of it, who are taught by S. Paul, that in Christ this prophecy was fulfilled, as it is written, *Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offence, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed?* It was no other then *Jehovah* who spake those words, *I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord (Jehovah) their God, and will not save them by bow nor sword.* Where not only he who is descri-

* As Mldrash.
Tillim on 21.
Psal. Ecba
Rabai Lam.
1. 6.

Is. 8. 14.
a Rom. 9. 33.
b Hof. 1. 7.
where it is
further obser-
vable that the
Chaldee Para-
phrase hath
בְּיְהוָה דָּוִד
for בְּיְהוָה by
the word of Je-
hovah for Je-
bed hovah.

bed as the originall and principall cause, that is, the Father who gave his Son, but also he who is the immediate efficient of our salvation, & that in opposition to all other meanes or instrumentall causes, is call'd *Jehovah*; who can be no other then our Jesus, because *there is no other name under heaven given unto men whereby we must be saved.*

Act. 4. 12.

Zach. 10. 12.

As in another place he speaketh, *I will strengthen them in the Lord (Jehovah) and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the Lord (Jehovah);* where he which strengtheneth is one, and he by whom he strengtheneth is another, clearly distinguished from him by the personall pronoun, and yet each of them is *Jehovah*, and *Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.* Whatsoever † objections may

Deut. 6. 4.

† Two Adversaries we have

to the exposition of this place, the Jew and the Socinian; onely with this difference, that we find the lesse opposition from the Jew, from whom indeed we have so ample a concession as will destroy the others contradiction. First Socinus answers, the name belongeth not to Christ but unto Israel; and that it so appears by a parallel place in the same Prophet, Jer. 33. 15, 16. Socin. refut. Jac. Wicli. cap. 6. Catech. Racov. de Pers. Christi, c. 1. Crell. de Deo & Attr. l. 1. c. 11. To this we first oppose the constant interpretation of the Jewes, who attribute the name *Jehovah* to the Messias from this one particular Text. As in the Sepher Ikkarim. l. 2. c. 8. וְקָרָא יְהוָה צְדִיקוֹ

הַכְתוּב שֵׁם הַמְּשִׁיחַ וְיָי. The Scripture calleth the name of the Messias *Jehovah our righteousness.* And in Midrasch Tillim. on Psal. 21. וְקָרָא לְמֶלֶךְ הַמְּשִׁיחַ בְּשֵׁמוֹ וְיָי וְיָי שֵׁם יְהוָה אֵשׁ מְלַחְמָה יְהוָה שֵׁמוֹ וְיָי וְיָי. God calleth the Messias by his own name, and his name is *Jehovah*, as it is said (Ex. 15. 2.) *The Lord is a man of warre, Jehovah is his name. And it is written of the Messias, (Jer. 23. 6.)*

And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness. Thus Echa Rabati. Lm. 1. 6. מִה שֵׁם שֶׁל מְשִׁיחַ אֵל אֲבָא יְהוָה שֶׁמֶר שֵׁם יְהוָה שֵׁם. What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, *Jehovah is his name.* As it is said (Jer. 23. 6.) *And this is the name which they shall call him, Jehovah our righteousness.* The same he reports of Rabbi Levi. The Rabbins then, though enemies to the truth which we deduce from thence, constrained by the literall importance of the text, did acknowledge that the name *Jehovah* did belong to the Messias. And as for the collection of the contrary from the parallel place pretended, there is not so great a similitude as to inforce the same interpretation. For whereas in the 23, 6. of Jeremiah it is expressly said, וְיָי שֵׁם יְהוָה this is the name, in the 33. it is onely יְהוָה without any mention of a name; and surely that place cannot prove *Jehovah* to be the name of Israel, which speaks not one word of the name of Jerusalem; for where we read in Crellius, hoc scilicet nomen est, all but hoc is not

be

Scripture, but the glosse of Crellius, and hoc it self cannot be warranted for the interpretation of יהוה, nor quo for יהוה; the simplest interpretation of those words יהוה אלהינו אלהינו, being iste qui vocabitur eam, he which calleth Ierusalem is the Lord our righteousness, that is, Christ. And thus the first answer of Socinus is invalid, which he easily foreseeing, hath joyned with the Jewish Rabbins in the second answer, admitting that Iehovah our righteousness is the name of the Messias, but will deny that the Christ is that Iehovah. To which purpose they offer those words, Iehovah our righteousness, to be delivered by way of proposition, not of apposition; and this they endeavour to prove by such places of Scripture as seem to inferre as much. As Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Iehovah nissi, Ex. 17. 15. Gideon built an altar unto the Lord, and called it Iehovah Shalom. Judg. 6. 24. And the name of the City in the last words of Ezekiel is Iehovah Shammah. In all which places it is most certain that the name Iehovah is not predicated of that, of whose name it is a part; but is the subject of a proposition, given by way of nomination, whose verb substantive or copula is understood. But from thence to conclude, that the Lord our righteousness can be no otherwise understood of Christ then as a Proposition, and that we by calling him so according to the Prophets prediction, can understand no more thereby then that God the Father of Christ doth justify us, is most irrational. For first, it is therefore necessary to interpret those names by way of a Proposition of themselves, because Iehovah cannot be the predicate of that which is named; it being most apparent that an Altar or a City built, cannot be God: and whatsoever is not Iehovah without addition, cannot be Iehovah with addition. But there is no incongruity in attributing of that name to Christ, to whom we have already proved it actually given; and our Adversaries who teach, that the name Iehovah is sometimes given to the Angels representing God, must acknowledge that it may be given unto Christ whom they confesse to be above all Angels, and farre more fully and exactly to represent the Father. Secondly, that which is the addition in those names, cannot be truly predicated of that thing which beares the name. Moses could not say that Altar was his exaltation, nor Gideon that it was his peace; and if it could not so be predicated by it self, it could neither be by apposition, and consequently, even in this respect, it was necessary to make the name a Proposition. But our righteousness may undoubtedly be predicated of him who is here called by the name of the Lord our righteousness, for the Apostle hath expressly taught us that he is made righteousness unto us. 1 Cor. 1. 30. and if it may be in it self, there can be no repugnancy in its predication by way of apposition. Thirdly, that addition of our righteousness doth not only truly belong to Christ, but in some manner properly and peculiarly, so as in that notion it can belong to no other person call'd Iehovah but to that Christ alone. For he alone is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, Ro. 10. 4. and when he is said to be made unto us righteousness, 1 Cor. 1. 30. he is thereby distinguished from God the Father. Being then Christ is thus peculiarly called our righteousness under the Gospel, being the place of the Prophet forementioned speaketh of this as a name to be used under the Gospel, being no other person called Iehovah is ever expressly call'd our righteousness in the Gospel; it followeth not onely that Christ may be so called, but that the prophecy cannot otherwise be

fulfilled, then by acknowledging that Christ is the Lord our righteousness: and consequently that is his name, not by way of proposition, but of apposition and appropriation; so that being both Jehovah and our righteousness, he is as truly Jehovah as our righteousness.

Jer. 23. 6.

be fram'd against us, we know Christ is the righteous branch raised unto David; the King that shall reign and prosper, in whose dayes Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; we are assured that this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousnesse, the Lord, that is, *Jehovah*, the expression of his supremacy; and the addition of *Our righteousness* can be no diminution to his Majesty. If those words in the Prophet,

Zach. 2. 10, 11.

Sing and rejoyce, O daughter of Sion, for lo I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee saith the Lord (Jehovah,) did not sufficiently of themselves denote our Saviour who dwelt amongst us, as they certainly do; yet the words which follow would evince as much: *And many nations shall be joynd to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee;* for what other Lord can we conceive dwelling in the midst of us, and sent unto us by the Lord of hosts, but Christ?

Joel 2. 32.

And as the originall *Jehovah* was spoken of Christ by the holy Prophets, so the title of *Lord*, as the usuall interpretation of that name, was attributed unto him by the Apostles. In that signall prediction of the first age of the Gospel, God promised by *Joel*, that *whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be deliver'd;* and *S. Paul* hath assured us that Christ is that *Lord*, by proving from thence that *whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.* and inferring from that, if we confesse with our mouth the *Lord Jesus*, we shall be saved. For if it be a certain truth, that whosoever confesseth the *Lord Jesus* shall be saved; and the certainty of this truth depend upon that foundation, that whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed; and the certainty of that in relation

*Rom. 10. 9,
11, 13.*

to Christ depend upon that other promise, whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved; then must the Lord in the thirteenth verse of the tenth Chapter to the Romans, be the same with the Lord Jesus in the ninth verse, or else S. Pauls Argument must be invalid and fallacious, as containing that in the conclusion which was not comprehended in the premises. But the Lord in the ninth verse is no other then *Jehovah*, as appeareth by the Prophet *Joel* from whom that Scripture is taken. Therefore our Saviour in the New Testament is called Lord, as that name or title is the interpretation of *Jehovah*. If we consider the office of *John* the Baptist peculiar unto him, we know it was he of whom it is written in the Prophet *Malachi*, *I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me*; we are sure he which spake those words, was (*Jehovah*) the Lord of hosts, and we are as sure that Christ is that Lord, before whose face *John* the Baptist prepared the way. The Voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, saith *Isaiah*, *Prepare ye the way of the Lord* (*Jehovah*.) And this is he that was spoken of by the Prophet *Isaiah*, saith S. *Matthew*; this is he of whom his father *Zachariah* did divinely preface, *thou child shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his wayes*; where Christ is certainly the Lord, and the Lord * undeniably *Jehovah*.

Mat. 11. 10.

Malach. 3. 1.

Mat. 3. 3.

Luk. 1. 76.

* I say therefore undeniably, because it is not only the

undoubted translation of the name *יהוה* in the Prophet, (which of it self were sufficient) but also is delivered in that manner which is, (though unreasonably) required to signifie the proper name of God, *θεοπροσωπον Ἰδ πρὸς θεοῦ Kueu*, not *θεο* Kueu, that is without, not with an Article. For now our Saviour's Deity must be tried by a new kind of School-Divinity, and the most fundamentall Doctrine, maintained as such ever since the Apostles times by the whole Catholick Church, must be examined, censur'd and condemned by *ὁ, ἡ, τὸ*. Socinus first makes use of this observation against *Wiekus*, and after him *Crellius* hath laid it as a grave and serious foundation, and spread it out into its severall corners, to uphold the fabrick of his superstitions. First, *Vox Jehovah magis quam cetera Dei nomina propriorum naturam*

sequitur, ideo etiam Græca κθεος cum pro illa ponitur, propriorum indolem, qua licet, æmulatur. Secondly, Propriis nominibus articulus libentius subtrahitur, licet cum etiam sæpe concinnitatis potius quam necessitatis causâ admittant. Idem fit in voce κθεος cum pro Jehovah ponitur. Thirdly, Hæc est causa cur in novo Testamento, maxime apud Lucam & Paulum, vox κθεος cum Deum summum designat, articulo libentius circat; At cum de Christo subjective usurpatur, raro articulus omittitur. *What strange uncertainties are these to build the denial of so important an Article as Christs divinity upon? He does not say absolutely Jehovah is the proper name of God, but onely that it doth more follow the nature of proper names then the other names of God: and indeed it is certain that sometimes it hath the nature of an appellative, as Deut. 6. 4. יהוה אחד יהוה אחד יהוה אחד, the Lord our God is one Lord; and yet if it be not alwayes and absolutely a Proper name, though all the rest were granted to be true, the Argument must be of no validity. Again, he cannot say an Article is never affixed to a Proper name, but onely that libentius subtrahitur, rather omitted then affixed; which yet is farre from a certain or a true rule, especially in the language of the New Testament. For no man can deny Jesus to be the proper name of Christ, given him according to the Law at his Circumcision, καὶ ἐμλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, Luc. 2. 21. and yet whosoever shall read the Gospel of S. Matthew, will find it ten times ὁ Ἰησοῦς with an Article, for once Ἰησοῦς without it. And in the Acts of the Apostles written in a more Attick stile, S. Paul is oftner stiled ὁ Παῦλος, then simply Παῦλος. So Balaam, Gallio &c. Some persons we find in the New Testament, whom, if we should stay till we found them without an Article, we should never call by their names at all, as Apelles, Balac, &c. Thirdly, ὁ Κθεος is so often used for that God who is the Father with an Article, and Κθεος for the Son without an Article; For the Father, Mat. 1, 22. 2, 15. 5, 33. 22, 44. Mar. 12, 36. Luk. 1, 6, 9. 15, 25, 46. 2, 15, 22, 23. 10, 42. Act. 2, 25, 34. 3, 20. 17, 27. Ro. 15, 11. 1 Cor. 10, 16. 16, 7. 2 Cor. 5, 11. Eph. 5, 17, 19. Col. 3, 16, 20, 23. 2 Thess. 3, 3. 2 Tim. 1, 16. Heb. 8, 2, 11. 12, 14. Ja. 4, 10, 15. 1 Pet. 2, 3. For the Son, Mat. 3, 3. 22, 43. 45. Mar. 1, 3. Lu. 1, 76. 2, 11. 3, 4. 20, 44. Joh. 1, 23. Act. 2, 36. 10, 36. 11, 16, 21. 15, 11. Ro. 1, 7. 10, 9, 12. 14, 6, 8, 14. 16, 2, 8, 11, 12, 13, 22. 1 Cor. 1, 3. 4, 16. 7, 22. 25, 39. 9, 1. 2. 10, 21. 11, 11. 12, 3. 14, 37. 15, 58. 16, 10, 19. 2 Cor. 1, 2. 2, 12. 4, 5. 10, 17. 11, 17. 12, 1. Gal. 1, 3. 5, 10. Eph. 1, 2, 1, 21. 4, 1, 5. 17. 5, 8. 6, 1, 4, 10, 21, 23. Phil. 1, 2, 14. 2, 11, 19, 24. 29. 3, 1, 20. 4, 1, 2, 10. Col. 1, 3. 3, 17, 18, 24. 4, 1, 7, 17. 1 Thess. 1, 1. 3, 8. 4, 1, 15, 17. 5, 2, 12. 2 Thess. 1, 1. 2. 2, 13. 3, 4. 1 Tim. 1, 1. 2 Tim. 2, 24. Tit. 1, 4. Philem. 3, 16, 20. Ja. 1, 1. 2 Pet. 3, 8, 10. 2 Joh. 3. Jud. 14. Rev. 14, 13. 19, 16. I say, they are thus so often us'd, that though they equall not the number of their contrary acceptations, yet they come so near as to yield no ground for any such observation, as if the Holy Ghost intended any such Article-distinction. Nay it is most evident that the sacred pen-men intended no such distinction, because in the same place speaking of the same person, they usually observe the indifferency of adding or omitting the Article; As Ja. 5. 11. Τὴν ὑπομονὴν Ἰαβὼ καέσκις, καὶ τὸ τέλος Κτεῖς ἐλάστε, ὅτι πολλὸς πλῆγος ὄντι ὁ Κτεῖος καὶ οἱ κτήριον. 2 Tim. 1. 18. Δὲν αὐτὸς ὁ Κτεῖος ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ καὶ Κτεῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. 1 Cor. 7. 17. Ἐκείνους ὡς κέκληκαν ὁ Κτεῖος*

ειος, οὕτω πειπαιτεῖται. 22. ὁ ᾧ ὄν Κυεῖω κληθεῖς Δὺλθ, ἀπλεῦδτος Κυ-
 εῖω ἐστίν. See Ro. 14. 6, 7, 8. Wherefore being Jehovah is not affirmed absolutely to be
 a proper name; being, if it were, yet it appears that it is not the custome of the New
 Testament to use every Proper Name ofner without an Article then with one; being
 ὁ Κυεῖω is so often taken for him whom they acknowledge God, and Κυεῖω for him
 whom they cannot deny to be the Christ; it followeth, that Christ acknowledged to
 be the Lord, cannot by any virtue of an Article be denied to be the true Jehovah. We
 must not then think to decide this Controversy by the Articles, of which the sacred
 pen-men were not curious, and the Transcribers have been very careless; nor is
 there so great uncertainty of the ancient MSS. in any thing, as in the words and Ar-
 ticles of Κυεῖος and Θεός. The Vulgar Edition, Revel. 1. 8. habet λέγει ὁ κύριος
 only, the Complutensis λέγει κύριος ὁ Θεός, Plantine λέγει ὁ κύριος ὁ Θεός, a-
 gainst the Socinian Rule, who will have an accession by ὁ το Θεός, and a diminution
 by ὁ from κύριος. As Rev. 4. 11. Ἄξιός ἐστι κύριος λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν. In other Mss
 Ἄξιός ἐστι ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν ὁ ἄξιός λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν. 1 Cor. 11. 27.
 τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυεῖω ἀναξίως. Others with an addition, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυεῖω
 ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυεῖω. 1 Cor. 14. 37. The vulgar Edition ὅτι το Κυεῖω οἰσὶν ἐντολαί.
 the Complutense ὅτι Κυεῖω. So where we usually read Χειρὸς, divers ancient MSS.
 have Κυεῖος. Lastly, it is observable that even in these words of the Creed which
 we now expound, Κυεῖος is spoken expressly of Christ without an Article; for so
 we read it, Καὶ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χειρὸν, τὸν ὕδν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, Κυεῖον ἡμῶν.

Nor is this the onely Notation of the name or title
 Lord, taken in a sense divine, above the expression of all
 mere humane power and dominion; for as it is often used as
 the interpretation of the name *Jehovah*, so is it also for
 that of *Adon* or *Adonai*. The Lord said unto my Lord, Ps. 110. 1.
 saith David, that is in the originall, *Jehovah* unto *Adon*,
 and that *Adon* is the Word, that Lord is Christ. We † Chal. Paraph.
 know the Temple at *Jerusalem* was the Temple of the
 most High God, and the Lord of that Temple in the em-
 phasis of an Hebrew Article was Christ, as appeareth by
 that Prophecy, The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly Malac. 3.
 come to his Temple, even the messenger of the Covenant, 77287.
 whom ye delight in.

Now this Notation, as it is the interpretation of *Adon*,
 signifieth immediately and properly *dominion*, implying a
 right of possession, and power of disposing. Which doth
 not onely agree with that other notion of *Jehovah*, but
 presuppose it, as following and flowing from it. For He
 who

who alone hath a being or existence of himself, and thereby is the fountain of all things beside himself; must be acknowledged to have full power and dominion over all. Because every thing must necessarily belong to him, from whom it hath received what it is. Wherefore being Christ is the *Lord*, as that title is taken for *Jehovah*, the name of God, expressing the necessary existence, and independence of his single being, and consequently the dependency of all others upon him; it followeth that he be acknowledged also the *Lord*, as that name expresseth *Adon*, signifying power authoritative, and proper dominion. Thus having explained the Notation of the word *Lord*, which we propounded as the first part of our exposition, we come next to the second, which is to declare the nature of this Dominion, and to shew, how, and in what respect Christ is *the Lord*.

Now for the full and exact understanding of the Dominion seated or invested in Christ as the *Lord*, it will be necessary to distinguish it according to that diversity which the Scriptures represent unto us. As therefore we have observed two natures united in his person, so must we also consider two kinds of dominion belonging respectively to those natures, one inherent in his Divinity, the other bestowed upon his Humanity; one, by which he is the Lord the Maker of all things, the other, by which he is made the Lord of all things.

Joh. 1. 1, 3.

As for the first, we are assured, that the *Word was God*, that by the same Word *all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made*; we must acknowledge, that whosoever is the creatour of all things, must have a direct dominion over all, as belonging to the possession of the Creatour who made all things. Therefore the *Word*, that is, Christ as God, hath the supreme and universall dominion of the world. Which was well expressed by that famous confession of no longer doubting but believing Thomas, *My Lord, and my God.*

Joh. 20. 28.

As

As for the second, it is also certain that there was some kind of Lordship given or bestowed on Christ, whose very unction proves no lesse then an imparted dominion: as S. Peter tells us, that he was *made both Lord and Christ*. *Act. 2. 36.* What David spake of man; the Apostle hath applied peculiarly to him, *thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thine hands, thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.* *Heb. 2. 7, 8.*

Now a Dominion thus imparted, given, derived, or bestowed, cannot be that which belongeth unto God, as God, founded in the divine nature, because whatsoever is such, is absolute and independent. Wherefore this Lordship thus imparted or acquired, appertaineth to the humane nature, and belongeth to our Saviour, as the Son of man. The right of judicature is part of this power, and Christ himself hath told us, that the Father *bath given him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of man*; and by virtue of this delegated authority, the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels, and reward every man according to his works. Part of the same Dominion is the power of forgiving sins, as pardoning no lesse then punishing, is a branch of the supreme Magistracy; and Christ did therefore say to the sick of the palsy, *thy sins be forgiven thee, that we might know that the Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins.* *Mat. 9. 2, 6.* Another branch of that power is the alteration of the law, there being the same authority required to abrogate or alter, which is to make a law; and Christ asserted himself to be *greater then the Temple*, shewing that the Son of man was Lord even of the Sabbath day. *Mat. 12. 8.*

This Dominion thus given unto Christ in his humane nature, was a direct and plenary power over all things, but was not actually given him at once, but part while he lived on earth, part after his death and resurrection. For though it be true, that *Jesus knew*, before his death, that the Father had given all things into his hands, yet it is observable

Rom. 14.9.

Mat. 28.18.

Ps. 110.7.

Philip. 2.8,9,
10,11.Eph. 1.20,21,
22.

servable that in the same place it is written that he likewise knew *that he was come from God, and went to God*, and part of that power he received when he came from God, with part he was invested when he went to God; the first to enable him, the second, not onely so, but also to reward him. *For to this end Christ both died, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* After his resurrection he said to the Disciples, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore he hath lift up his head. Because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the crosse, Therefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confesse that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Thus for and after his death, he was instated in a full power and dominion of all things, even as the Son of man, but exalted by the Father, who raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, farre above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church.

Now as all the power given unto Christ as man had not the same beginning in respect of the use or possession, so neither when begun, shall it all have the same duration. For part of it being merely Oeconomically, aiming at a certain end, shall then cease and terminate, when that end for which 'twas given shall be accomplished: part being either due upon the union of the humane nature with the divine, or upon covenant as a reward for the sufferings endured in that nature, must be coevall with that union and that nature which so suffered, and consequently must be eternall.

Of

Of the first part of this Dominion did *David* speak, when by the spirit of prophecy he call'd his Son his Lord. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy foot-stool*: where the continuation of Christ's dominion over his enemies is promised to be prolonged untill their finall and totall subjection. *For he must reign, till he hath put all things under his feet*. And as we are sure of the continuation of that kingdome till that time, so are we assured of the resignation at that time. *For when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, then shall he deliver up the kingdome to God, even the Father. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all*. Thus he which was appointed to rule in the midst of his enemies during their rebellion, shall resign up his commission after their subjection.

Psal. 110. 1.

1 Cor. 15. 25.

1 Cor. 15. 24.
28.

Psal. 110. 2.

But we must not look upon Christ onely in the nature of a Generall, who hath received a Commission; or of an Embassadour, with perfect instructions; but of the onely Son of God, impowred and employed to destroy the enemies of his Fathers Kingdome: and though thus empowered and commissioned, though resigning that authority which hath already had its perfect work, yet still the onely Son and the heir of all things in his Fathers house, never to relinquish his dominion over those whom he hath purchased with his own blood, never to be deprived of that reward which was assigned him for his sufferings; for if the prize which we expect in the race of our imperfect obedience be an immarcesable crown, if the weight of glory which we look for from him be eternall, then cannot his perfect and absolute obedience be crowned with a fading power, or he cease ruling over us, who hath alwayes reigned in us. We shall for ever reign with him, and he will make us priests and kings, but so that he con-

tinue still for ever High Priest, and King of kings.

The certainty of this eternall Dominion of Christ as man, we may well ground upon the promise made to *David*, because by reason of that promise, Christ himself is called *David*. For so God speaketh concerning his people. *I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them, I the Lord have spoken it.* Now the promise was thus made expressly to *David*. *Thy house and thy kingdome shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* And although that terme *for ever* in the Hebrew language may signifie oftentimes no more then a certain duration so long as the nature of the thing is durable; or at the utmost, but to the end of all things, and so the Oeconomical Dominion or Kingdome of Christ may be thought sufficiently to fulfill that promise, because it shall certainly continue so long as the nature of that Oeconomy requireth, till all things be performed for which Christ was sent, and that continuation will infallibly extend unto the end of all things: yet sometimes also the same term *for ever* signifieth that absolute eternity of future duration which shall have no end at all; and that it is so farre to be extended particularly in that promise made to *David*, and to be fulfilled in his Son, is as certain as the promise. For the Angel *Gabriel* did give that clear exposition to the blessed Virgin, when in this manner he foretold the glory of him who was then to be conceived in her wombe, *the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdome there shall be no end.* Nor is this clearer in *Gabriel's* explication of the promise, then in *Daniel's* prevision of the performance; who saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes,

1 zek. 34. 23,
24.

2 Sam. 7. 16.
עו עו עו

Lu. 1. 32, 33.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

dayes, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdome, that all people and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not passe away, and his kingdome that which shall not be destroyed.

Thus Christ is Lord both by a naturall and independent Dominion, as God, the Creatour, and consequently the owner of the works of his hands, and by a derived, imparted, and dependent right, as man, sent, anointed, raised, and exalted, and so made Lord and Christ; which authoriry so given and bestowed upon him, is partly Oeconomicall, and therefore to be resigned into the hands of the Father, when all those ends for which it was imparted, are accomplished: partly so proper to the union, or due unto the passion of the humane nature, that it must be co-evall with it, that is of eternall duration.

The third part of our Explication is the due consideration of the object of Christs Dominion, enquiring whose Lord he is, and how *ours*. To which purpose first observe the latitude, extent, or rather universality of his power, under which all things are comprehended, as subjected to it. For he is Lord of all saith S. Peter, of all things, and of all persons; and he must be so, who made all things as God, and to whom all power is given as man. To him then all things are subjected whose subjection implyeth not a contradiction. For he hath put all things under his feet; but when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. God onely then excepted, whose originall Dominion is repugnant to the least subjection, all things are subject unto Christ, whether they be things in heaven, or things on earth. In heaven he is farre above all principalities and powers, and all the Angels of God worship him; Heb. 1.6. on earth all nations are his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth are his possession. Thus Christ is certainly

certainly *our Lord* because he is the Lord of all and when all things were subjected to him, we were not excepted.

But in the midst of this Universality of Christ's Regall authority, it will be further necessary to find some propriety of dominion, by which he may be said to be peculiarly *our Lord*. 'Tis true, he made us, and not we ourselves, we are the work of his hands, but the lowest of his Creatures can speak as much. We are still preserved by his power, and as he made us, so doth he maintain us; but at the same time he feedeth the ravens, and cloatheth the lilies of the field. Wherefore beside his originall right of creation, and his continued right of preservation, we shall find a more peculiar right of Redemption, belonging properly to the sons of men. And in this Redemption, though a single word, we shall find a † double title to a most just Dominion, one of conquest, another of purchase.

† For the right understanding of this double title involved in the word

Redemption, it will be necessary to take notice of the ways by which Humane Dominion is acquired, and servitude introduced. *Servi aut nascuntur, aut fiunt, sicut the Civilian. Inst. l. 1. tit. 3. but in Theology we say more, Servi & nascuntur, & fiunt. Man is born the servant of God his maker, man is made the servant of his redeemer. Two ways in generall they observ'd, by which they came to serve, who were not born slaves. Fiunt aut jure gentium, id est, captivitate, aut jure civili, cum liber homo major viginti annis ad precium pat.icipandum sese vendidit passus est. Two ways then also there were by which Dominion over those servants was acquired, by conquest or by purchase, and both these were alwayes accounted just. Dionysius Halicarnassæus, an excellent Historian, a curious observer of the Roman customs, and an exact judge of their actions, being a Grecian, justifieth the right which the Masters in Rome claimed over their servants upon these two grounds. Εὐθὺς αὖτε διὰ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις αἱ οὗτοι δεσποῦντων κτήσεως κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην γινώσκουσιν τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπων, ἢ ὅτι ἀνθρώποι κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τῶν ἀπὸ θεοῦ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ ὅτι σφετέρῃ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῖς ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀλλὰς ἀφαιρέταις καὶ ἀφαιρούμενοι τοῖς λαβόντων ἔχειν, ἢ πριάμενοι παρ' ἐτέρων κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν γεγονότων ἐκείνων τὴν δίκην. Hist. l. 4. where it is also further to be observed, that the same persons were made slaves by conquest, and possessed by purchase, by conquest to the City of Rome, by purchase to the Roman citizen. The Generall first took and saved them, and so made them his, that is, reduced them to the will and power of the State from which he received his Commission, and in whose name, and for whose interest he fought: This State expos'd their interest to sale, and so whatever*

We

right had been gained by the conquering sword, was devolved on the Roman Citizen for a certain summe of money paid to the State to defray the charges of that warre. Thus every Lord or Master of a slave so taken, had full power over him, and possession of him, by right of purchase, unto which he was first made liable by conquest. And though not exactly in that manner, yet by that double right is Christ become our Lord, and we his servants.

We were first servants of the Enemy of God, for, him we obeyed, and his servants we are whom we obey; when Ro. 6. 16. Christ through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil, and delivered us, He spoiled Col. 2. 15. principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly triumphing over them. But contrary to the custome of triumphing Conquerours, he did not sell, but buy us; because while he saved us, he died for us, and that death was the price by which he purchased us; even so this dying Victor gave us life; upon the Crosse as his triumphant chariot he shed that precious blood which bought us, and thereby became our Lord, by right of Redemption, both as to conquest, and to purchase.

Beside, he hath not onely bought us, but provided for us; what e're we have, we receive from him as the Master of the family; we hold of him all temporall and eternall blessings, which we enjoy in this, or hope for in another life. He is the Prince of life, and by him we live; he is the Lord of glory, and we are called by his Gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord. Wherefore he hath us under his dominion, and becomes our Lord by right of Promotion.

Lastly, men were not anciently sold alwayes by others, but sometimes by themselves, and whosoever of us truly believe in Christ, have given up our names unto him. In our baptismall vow we bind our selves unto his service, that henceforth we will not serve sin, but yield our selves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and our members as instruments of righteousness unto God: that as we have yielded our members servants to uncleanness, and

and to iniquity: even so we should yield our members servants to righteousness, unto holiness. And thus the same Dominion is acknowledged by compact, and confirm'd by Covenant, and so Christ becomes our Lord by right of Obligation.

The Necessity of believing and professing our faith in this part of the Article, appeareth first in the discovery of our condition; For by this we know that we are not our own, neither our persons, nor our possessions, nor our actions. Know ye not, saith S. Paul, that ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price. Ancient servitude, to which the Scriptures relate, put the servants wholly in the * possession of their Master, so that their persons were as properly his, as the rest of his goods. And if we be so in respect of Christ, then may we not live to our selves, but to him, for in this the difference of † service and freedome doth properly consist: we cannot do our own wills, but the will of him whose we are. Christ took up-

1 Cor. 6. 19, 20.

* Δύλαϑ κτῆ-
μα τιμω-
ρον καὶ ὡς ὁ
ὄργανον παρὰ
ὄργανον πάς
ὁ ὑποκρίτης.
Aristo. Pol.
1. 1. c. 4. Τό-
τε δὲ σῶμα
ἔστιν ὄργανον

ὤμοφρον, καὶ τῷ δεσπότῃ ὁ δούλος, ὡς ὁ μείων καὶ ὄργανον ἀφαιρετόν, τὸ δ' ὄ-
ργανον ὡς περ δούλος ἀφύρτος. Idem. Eth. 1. 8. c. 9. and again more expressly, Τίς
μὲν ἐν ἡ φύσει τῷ δούλῳ, καὶ τίς ἡ δυνάμις, ἐκ τέτων δούλων. Ὁ δὲ μὴ αὐτῷ φύ-
σει, ἀλλ' ἄλλῳ, ἀνθρώπος δὲ, ὅτος φύσει δούλος ἔστιν, ἄλλῳ δ' ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπος, ὡς
ἀν κτῆμα ἢ, ἀνθρώπος ὢν. So that the definition of a servant according to Aristotle,
is he, who being a man, is notwithstanding the possession of a man. And although all
Relatives be predicated of each other in obliquo, as pater est filii pater, & filius pa-
tris filius; dominus est servi dominus, & servus domini servus: Yet he observes a
difference in this, that a servant is not onely servus domini, but simply domini,
but the master is not simply servi, but dominus scilicet vi. Ὁ μὲν δεσπότης τῷ δούλῳ
δεσπότης μόνον, ἐκείνῳ δὲ ἔκ τινος ὁ δὲ δούλος ἢ μόνον δεσπότην δούλος ἔστιν, ἀλ-
λά καὶ ὁλος ἐκείνου. The servant then is so wholly in the possession and for the use of
his master, that he is nothing else but a living tool or instrument; insomuch sayes he, that
if all tooles were like those of Dædalus, or the Tripodes of Vulcan, which the Poets
fained to move of themselves, Artificers would need no under workmen, nor masters
servants.

† So Aristotle Ethic. 4. πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν δυνάμει. and in the
first of his Rhetoricks on the contrary, ἐλευθέριον τὸ μὴ πρὸς ἄλλον ζῆν. || τὸ
ζῆν ὡς βέλεται τις τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἔργον, ὡς περ τῷ δούλῳ ὄντος, τὸ ζῆν καὶ οὐ
βέλεται, Arist. Pol. 6. 2. Quid est libertas? potestas vivendi ut velis. Cicero Parado.

on him the form of a servant, and to give us a proper and perfect example of that condition, he telleth us, *I came down from heaven, not to doe mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* First therefore we must conclude with the Apostle, reflecting upon Christ's Dominion and our Obligation, that *none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's.* *Joh. 6.38. Ro. 14.7,8.*

Secondly, the same is necessary both to inforce, and invite us to obedience; to inforce us, as *the Lord*, to invite us, as *Christ the Lord*. If we acknowledge our selves to be his servants, we must *bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.* He which therefore died, and rose and revived, that he might become the Lord both of the dead and living, maketh not that death & resurrection efficacious to any but such, as by their service acknowledge that Dominion which he purchased. He *though he were a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and being made perfect, he is become the Author of eternall salvation unto all them that obey him.* Thus the consideration of the power invested in him, and the necessity of the service due unto him, should force us to obedience; while the consideration of Him whom we are thus oblig'd to serve, should allure and invite us. When God gave the Law with fire and thunder, the affrighted *Israelites* desired to receive it from *Moses*, and upon that receipt promised obedience. *Go thou near, said they to him, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say, and speak thou unto us, and we will hear it & do it.* If they interpreted it so great a favour to receive the law by the hands of *Moses*; if they made so ready and chearfull a promise of exact obedience unto the law so given; how should we be invited to the same promise, and a better performance, who have received the whole will of God revealed to us by the Son of man? who are to give an account of our performance to the same

Man set down at the right hand of the Father? He first took our nature to become our brother, that with so near a relation he might be made our Lord. If then the Patriarchs did chearfully live in the land of *Goshen* subject to the power and command of *Egypt*, because that power was in the hand of *Joseph* their exalted brother; shall not we with all readinesse of mind, submit our selves to the divine dominion now given to him who gave himself for us? Shall all the Angels worship him, and all the Archangels bow down before him, and shall not we be proud to joyn with them?

Thirdly, the Belief of Christ's Dominion is necessary for the regulation of all power, authority, and dominion on earth, both in respect of those which rule, and in relation to those that obey. From hence the most absolute Monarchs learn, the people which they rule is not their own, but the Subjects of a greater prince, by him committed to their charge. Upon this *S. Paul* doth ground his admonition to *Masters*. *give unto your servants that which is just and equall, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.*

Col. 4. 1.

God gave a power to the *Israelites* to make hired servants of their brethren, but not slaves, and gives this reason of the interdiction, *For they are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as bondmen.*

Lev. 25. 42.

What tendernesse then should be used towards those, who are the servants of that Lord who redeemed them from a greater bondage, who bought them with a higher price? From hence those which are subject, learn to obey the powers which are of humane ordination, because in them they obey the Lord of all. Subjects bear the same proportion, and stand in the same relation to their Governours, with servants to their Masters: and *S. Paul*

Col. 3. 22, 23, 24.

hath given them this charge, *obey in all things your masters according to the flesh, and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance, for*

to serve the Lord Christ. Neither do we learn from hence onely whom, but also how to obey. For while we look upon one Lord in heaven, while we consider him as the Lord of Lords, we regulate our obedience to them by our service due to him, and so are alwayes ready to obey, but *in the Lord.*

Lastly, this Title of our Saviour is of necessary belief for our comfort and encouragement. For being Lord of all, he is able to dispose of all things for the benefit of those which serve him. He who commanded the uncon-
stant winds, and stilled the raging seas, he who multiplied the loaves and fishes, and created wine with the word of his mouth, hath all creatures now under exact obedience, and therefore none can want whom he undertaketh to provide for. *For the same Lord over all is rich unto all* Rom. 10. 12.
that call upon him. Many are the enemies of those persons who dedicate themselves unto his service; but our enemies are his, and part of his dominion is therefore given him, and to continue in him untill all his enemies be made his footstool. Great is the power of the lusts of our flesh which warre in our members, but his grace is sufficient for us, and the power of that spirit by which he ruleth in us. Heavy are the afflictions which we are called to undergoe for his sake, but if we suffer with him, we shall reign together with him, and blessed be that Dominion, which makes us all kings, that he may be for ever Lord of Lords, and King of Kings.

After this Explication, every Christian may perceive what he is to believe in this part of the Article, and expresse himself how he would be understood, when he maketh this profession of his faith, I believe in Christ *our Lord.* For thereby we may and ought to intend thus much; I doe assent unto this as a certain and infallible truth, taught me by God himself, that Jesus Christ the onely Son of God is the true *Jehovah*, who hath that being which is originally and eternally of it self, and of which

all other beings doe essentially depend; that by the right of emanation of all things from him, he hath an absolute, supreme, and universall Dominion over all things, as God; that as the Son of man he is invested with all power in heaven and earth; partly Oeconomicall, for the completing our redemption, and the destruction of our enemies, to continue to the end of all things, and then to be resigned to the Father, partly consequent unto the union, or due unto the obedience of his passion, and so eternall, as belonging to that kingdome which shall have no end. And though he be thus Lord of all things by right of the first creation, and constant preservation of them, yet is he more peculiarly the Lord of us who by faith are consecrated to his service; for through the work of our redemption he becomes our Lord both by the right of conquest and of purchase; and making us the sons of God, and providing heavenly mansions for us, he acquires a further right of promotion, which, considering the Covenant we all make to serve him, is at last completed in the right of a voluntary obligation; and thus I believe in Christ *our Lord.*

ARTICLE III.

Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

THese words, as they now stand, clearly distinguish the *conception* of Jesus from his *nativity*, attributing the first to the Holy Ghost, the second to the blessed Virgin; whereas the ancient Creeds made no such distinction, but without any particular expresse mention of the conception, had it onely in this manner, * *who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*; understanding by the word *born*, not only the nativity, but also the conception and generation. This is very necessary to be observed, because otherwise the addition of a word will prove the diminution of the sense of the Article. For they which speak onely of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Christs conception, and of the manner of his birth, leave out most part of that which was anciently understood under that one term of being *born* of the Holy Ghost, and of the Virgin *Mary*.

* Qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine. *Ruffinus in Symb. S. Aug. Ench. ad Laurent. c. 34. 37. & 33. Natus de Spiritu S. & Maria Virgine, as also the Council of Francford in Sacrosyllabo.*

S. Aug. de Fide & Symb. Natus est per Spiritum S. ex Virgine Maria. S. Leo. Epist. 10. c. 2. Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. Etherius Uxam. Author Symbol. ad Catechum. Qui natus est de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine. So also Venantius Fortunatus. From whence Fulgentius de Fide ad Petrum Diaconum. Natum de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine, in Symbolo acceptum, & corde ad justitiam credit, & ore ad salutem S. Ecclesia confitetur. And Aleuinus l. 3. de Trinit. c. 1. Dicitur in Symbolo Catholicæ fidei, quod Christus de Spiritu S. & ex Maria Virgine sit natus. In the Ancient MSS. transcribed by the learned Archbishop of Armagh, τὸν γεννῶντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. These words omitted in the Nicene Creed, were put in by the Council of Constantinople, upon the occasion of the Apollinarian Heresy, as was observed by Diogenes Bishop of Cyzicum in the Council of Chalcedon, Οἱ ὁμοῦτοι πατέρες οἱ κατὰ ταῦτα, τὸ ἐλεγκάμενοι, ὃ ἔστι πον οἱ ἁγιοι

ἐν Νιγηλᾷ πατέρις, ἐσφόνιζαν ἐπόντες, ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. In the severall expositions among the sermons de Tempore, falsely attributed to S. Aug. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu S. natus ex Virgine Maria. So Eusebius Gallicanus Homil. de Symbolo. And from thence it hath so continued, as we now read it, Which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.

That therefore nothing may be omitted which is pertinent to expresse the full intent, and to comprehend the utmost signification of this Article, we shall consider three Persons mentioned, so farre as they are concerned in it. The first is He who was conceived and born; the second, He by whose energie or operation he was conceived; the third, She who did conceive and bear him.

For the first, the Relative in the front of this, carries us clearly back unto the former Article, and tells us that he which was thus conceived and born, was Jesus Christ the onely Son of God. And being we have already demonstrated, that this onely Son is therefore called so, because he was begotten by the Father from all eternity, and so of the same substance with him; it followeth that this Article at the first beginning, or by vertue of its connexion, can import no lesse then this most certain but miraculous truth, that * He which was begotten by the Father before all worlds, was now in the fulnesse of time *conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.* Again, being by the conception and birth is to be understood whatsoever was done toward the production of the humane nature of our Saviour, therefore the same Relative considered with the words which follow it, can speak no lesse then the Incarnation of that Person: and thus even in the entry of the Article we meet with the Incarnation of the Son of God; that great mystery wrapt up in that short sentence of S. *John, The Word was made flesh.*

Indeed this Pronoun hath relation not onely unto this but to the following Articles, which have their necessary connexion with, and foundation in this Third: for He who

was

* Huic, quem
dudum de Patre
natum ineffabiliter
didicisti, nunc à
Sp. S. templum
fabricatum intra
secreta uteri
Virginæ
intellige.
Ruff.

was conceived and born, and so made man, did in that humane nature suffer, die, and rise again. Now when we say this was the Word, and that Word was God, being whosoever is God, cannot cease to be so; it must necessarily follow, that he was made man by joyning the humane nature with the Divine. But then we must take heed lest we conceive, because the Divine nature belongeth to the Father, to which the humane is conjoynd, that therefore the Father should be incarnate, or conceiv'd and born, For as certainly as the Son was crucified, and the Son alone, so certainly the same Son was incarnate, and that Son alone. Although the humane nature was conjoynd with the Divinity, which is the nature common to the Father and the Son, yet was that union made onely in the person of the Son. Which Doctrine is to be observed against the Heresy of the * *Patripassians*, which was both very ancient and farre diffus'd; making the Father to be

* The Heresy of the Patripassians seems onely to have relati-

on to the suffering of our Saviour, because the word signifies no more then the Passion of the Father. But it is founded in an error concerning the Incarnation, it being out of question, that he which was made man did suffer. Epiphanius observes, Noetus was the first which taught this Heresy, who lived 130 yeares before him, and when he was questioned for it he denied it. *Διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι πρὸς αὐτὸ ἐξελθεῖν τὴν πικρίαν.* But certainly this Heresy was ancienter then Noetus; for the Patripassiani are named by S. Cyprian, Epist. 73. and Tertullian his Master chargeth it upon Praxeas: Duo negotia Diaboli Praxeas Roma procuravit, Prophetiam expulit, & Hæresim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, & Patrem crucifixit. Adv. Prax. c. 1. And expressing the absurdity of that opinion, Itaque post tempus Pater natus & Pater passus, ipse Deus Dominus Omnipotens Jesus Christus prædicatur. c. 2. And De Præsc. adv. Hærer. Post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam Hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Hic Deum Patrem omnipotentem Jesum Christum esse dicit, hunc crucifixum passumque contendit; mortuum præterea seipsum sibi sedere ad dextram suam cum profana & sacrilega temeritate proponit. c. 53. After Praxeas Noetus taught the same, *ἐτόλμισι λέγειν τὸν πατέρα πρὸς δύνασθαι*, says Epiphanius, and being questioned for it, he answered, *τί γὰρ καὶ πρὸς δύνασθαι; ἕνα θεὸν δοξάζω, ἕνα ὁμολογῶ, καὶ ἐκ αὐτοῦ πάντων αὐτὸν γεννηθῆναι, πρὸς δύνασθαι, καὶ πρὸς πάσθαι.* He thought the Father and the Son to be the same Person, and therefore if the Son, the Father to be incarnate. *Ὅτι πατέρα τὸν Χριστὸν εἶδεν, τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καὶ ἄγιον πνεῦμα.* Epi. h. Anaceph. After the Noetiani followed the Sabellians. So Philastrius, Sabellius Discipulus incarnate,

ejus, qui similitudinem sui Doctoris itidem secutus est, unde & Sabelliani possunt appellari, qui & Patripassiani, & Praxeani à Praxeas, & Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Affrica, qui & ista sentientes abjecti sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica. So S. Aug. Sabelliani dicti sunt quidam Hæretici, qui vocantur & Patripassiani, qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum esse. Tract. 36. in Joh. *This I confesse is denied by Epiphanius, who acknowledges Sabellius to have followed Noetus in many things, but not in the Incarnation or Passion of the Father.* Σαβελλιανοὶ οἱ τὰ θεοῦ ἀνοήτως (l. ἀνοήτοις id est Nonπανοῖς, vel ἀνοήτω, id est, Nonτῶ, as S. Aug. Novato.) ὁ δὲ τὸ μόνον λέγει ὅτι μὴ πιστεύειν τὸν πατέρα. *This S. Augustine wonders very much at in Epiphanius, Sabelliani, inquir, similia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum; quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi possit, cum sic innotuerint dicere Patrem passum, ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani sæpius nuncupentur? Aug. Hær. 41. Indeed the Latine Fathers generally call the Sabellians Patripassians, and not onely so, but Theodoret doth so describe them, as professing one Person, ὅς μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ, ὡς πατὴρ νομοθετοῦ, ὅς δὲ τῇ καινῇ, ὡς υἱὸν ἐνανθρωπήσας. l. 2, c. 9. After the Sabelliani succeeded in the same Heresy the Priscillianists, as appeareth by Pope Leo, who shew they taught but one Person of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Quod blasphemix genus de Sabellii opinione sumpserunt, cujus discipuli etiam Patripassiani merito nuncupantur, quia si ipse est Filius qui & Pater, crux Filii Patris est passio, & quicquid in forma servi Filius Patri obediendo sustinuit, totum in se Pater ipse suscepit. Ep. 93. c. 1. Thus the Patripassian Heresy beginning from Praxeas and Hermogenes, was continued by Noetus, Sabellius, and Priscillianus, and mingled with all their severall Heresies: the summe and substance of which, is thus well set down by Victorinus. Patripassiani Deum solum esse dicunt, quæ unus Patrem dicimus; ipsum solum existentem & effectorem omnium, & venisse non solum in mundum, sed & in carnem, & alia omnia quæ nos Filium fecisse dicimus.*

* It appeareth plainly that Terrullian confuted Praxeas, by reducing him to these words of the Creed. For

when he had first declared, Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus (which was the objection of Praxeas) sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam οἰκονομία dicimus, ut unici Dei sit & Filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, & sine quo factum est nihil. Then he subjoyneth, Hunc missum à Patre in Virginem, & ex ea natum hominem & Deum, filium hominis, & filium Dei, & cognominatum Jesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuū, & sepultum secundum Scripturas, & resur-

First

clarum à Patre, & in cœlos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos. And that we may be assured that he used these words out of the Creed, it followeth, Hanc Regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisse, &c. This is yet further evident out of Epiphanius who tells us the Eastern Doctors confuted Noetus in the same manner, by reducing him to the words of the Creed. *Ἐνὰ θεὸν δοξάζομεν καὶ αὐτοῖς*, (just as Tertullian, nos unicum quidem Deum credimus) *ἀλλ' ὡς οἰδαμεν διγίως δοξάζοιεν· καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν ἔχομεν, ἀλλ' ὡς οἰδαμεν ἕνα Χριστὸν ὑπὸν θεοῦ, παθόντα ὡς ἑμᾶς, ἀποθνήσκοντα καὶ ὡς ἀπέθανεν, ἀναστάντα, ἀναλθόντα ὡς τὸν ἐγερθόν, ὄντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐρχόμενον κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.* And when the Argument of Tertullian against Praxeas, and the Greeks against Noetus drawn from the Creed, did not sufficiently convince the Patripassians, the Church of Aquileia to exclude them wholly, added these two words to the first Article, Invisibilem, and Impassibilem. Invisibilem, to shew he was not incarnate, Impassibilem, to shew he was not crucified. So Rufinus in the conclusion of his exposition upon these words Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, addeth, His additur invisibilem & impassibilem: and then gives the reason, Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos hæreseos causa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ à nostris Patripassiana appellatur, id est, quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, & visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur talis impietas de Patre, videntur hæc addidisse majores, & invisibilem Patrem atque impassibilem dixisse. Constat enim Filium, non Patrem, in carne & ex carne natum, & ex nativitate carnis Filium visibilem & passibilem factum.

First then we believe that He which was made flesh was the Word, that He which took upon him the nature of man was not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, nor any other Person but the onely begotten Son. And when we say that Person was *conceived* and *born*, we declare he was made really and truly man, of the same humane nature, which is in all other men, who by the ordinary way of generation are conceived and born. For the *Mediatour between God and man*, is the man Christ Jesus. That since by *man* came death, by *man* also should come the resurrection of the dead. As sure then as the first *Adam*, and we who are redeem'd are men, so certainly is the second *Adam* and our Mediatour man. He is therefore frequently called the *Son of man*, and in that nature he was alwayes promised: first to *Eve*, as her seed, and consequently her son; then to *Abraham*, in thy seed shall all the

1 Tim. 2. 5.

1 Cor. 15. 21.

Gen. 3. 15.

Gen. 22. 18.

S I

nations

Gal. 3. 6.

Rom. 1. 3.

Mat. 1. 1.

Heb. 2. 17.

Heb. 2. 14.

† *Marcion ut
carnem Christi
negaret, nega-
vit etiam nati-
vitatem; aut ut
nativitatem
negaret, negavit
& carnem, sci-
licet ne invi-
cem sibi testi-
monium red-
derent, & re-
sponderent na-
tivitytas & caro.
quia nec nati-
vitas sine carne,
nec caro sine
nativitate.
Tertull. de
Carne Christi.
c. 1.*

Lu. 24. 39.

nations of the earth be blessed, and that seed is Christ, and so he is the Son of Abraham. Next to David as his son to sit upon his throne, and so he is made of the seed of David according to the flesh, the son of David, the son of Abraham, and consequently of the same nature with David and with Abraham. And as he was their son, so are we his brethren, as descending from the same Father Adam; and therefore it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren. For he laid not hold on the Angels, but on the seed of Abraham, and so became not an Angel, but a man.

As then man consisteth of two different parts, Body and Soul, so doth Christ; He assumed a body at his conception, of the blessed Virgin. *Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.* The verity of his body stands upon the truth of his † nativity; and the actions and passions of his life shew the nature of his flesh.

He was first born with a body which was *prepared for him*, of the same appearance with those of other infants, he grew up by degrees, and was so farre from being sustained without accustomed nutrition of our bodies, that he was observed even by his enemies to come eating and drinking, and when he did not so, he suffered hunger and thirst. Those plowers never doubted of the true nature of his flesh, who *plowed upon his back, and made long furrows.* The thornes which pricked his sacred temples, the nailes which penetrated through his hands and feet, the spear which pierced his sacred side, give sufficient testimony of the naturall tenderneffe and frailty of his flesh. And lest his fasting forty dayes together, lest his walking on the waters and traversing the seas, lest his suddain standing in the midst of his disciples when the doores were shut, should raise an opinion that his body was not true and proper flesh; he confirmed first his own Disciples, *feel and see, that a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have.*

As

As therefore we believe the coming of Christ, so must we confesse him to have come in the verity of our humane nature, even in true and proper flesh. With this determinate expression was it alwayes necessary to acknowledge him: For every spirit that confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is not of God. This spirit appeared early in opposition to the Apostolicall doctrine, and Christ who is both God and man, was as soon denied to be man, as God. † *Simon Magus* the Arch-heretick first began, and many after followed him.

1 Jo. 4. 2, 3.

† *Simon Magus* first made himself to be Christ, and

what he feigned of himself, that was attributed by others unto Christ. Dixerat se in monte Sina legem Moysi in Patris persona dedisse Judæis, tempore Tiberii in Filii persona putative apparuisse. S. Aug. So S. Cyril represents him, ἐκ τοῦ Καπυαίου καὶ Μαγῶν οἷοι Χριστὸν παρὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Catech. 6. From this source of his invention arose the Heresy of the *Docetæ*. For Saturnilus, or Saturninus, followed him with his putative tantum hominem, as Irenæus; and in phantasmate tantum venisse, as Tertullian speaks. After him Valentinus, and his followers, Epiphanius, Isidorus, and Secundus: then the Marcionians, Heracleonites, and Ophites, Cerdon, Marcion, Lucanus, and generally the Maniches. These were the *Docetæ* or *Pharisees*, all conspiring in this, that Christ was not really what he appeared, nor did truly suffer what he seemed to endure.

And certainly if the Son of God would vouchsafe to take the frailty of our flesh, he would not omit the nobler part, our soul, without which he could not be man. For Jesus encreased in wisdom and stature, one in respect of his body, the other of his soul. Wisdom belongeth not to the flesh, nor can the knowledge of God, which is infinite, encrease: he then whose knowledge did improve together with his yeares, must have a subject proper for it, which was no other then a humane soul. This was the seat of his finite understanding, and directed will, distinct from the will of his father, and consequently of his divine nature, as appeareth by that known submission, not my will but thine be done. This was the subject of those affe-

Luk. 2. 52.

Luk. 22. 42.

Mat. 26. 38.

Luk. 23. 46.

otions and passions which so manifestly appeared in him; nor spake he any other then a proper language, when before his suffering he said, *My soul is exceeding sorrowfull, even unto death.* This was it which on the crosse before the departure from the body, he recommended to the Father, teaching us in whose hands the soules of the departed are, *For when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father into thy hands I commend my spirit, and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.* And as his death was nothing else but the separation of the soul from his body, so the life of Christ as man, did consist in the conjunction and vitall union of that soul with the body. So that he which was perfect God, was also perfect man, of a reasonable soul and humane flesh subsisting. Which is to be observed and asserted against the ancient Hereticks, who taught that Christ assumed humane flesh, but that the Word or his Divinity was unto that body in the place of an informing soul.

* Of this kind
two severall
sects were most
remarkable,
the Arians,
and the Apol-
linarians.

Arius taught that Christ had nothing of man but the flesh, and with that the word was joyned. Ἀρειῶς δὲ πέρα μόνον πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεότητος ἀμ-
λαγεῖ. ἀντὶ δὲ τῆ ἔσωσης ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, τετέστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ
σάρκι λέγει γενέσθαι. Athan. de Adv. Christi. Eunomius followed him in this
particular. Ἀρειῶς δὲ καὶ Εὐνόμιος σῶμα μὲν αὐτὸν ἔλασαν εἰληφέναι, δὲ τῆς
δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνεργητικὴν τὴν χεῖρα. Theodo. l. 5. cont. Hær. c. 11. Apollinarius
distinguished between the soul and the mind, the ψυχή and the νῦς, and acknowledg-
ed that the Word assumed the body and the soul or ψυχή of man, but not the mind
or spirit, or the νῦς, but the Word it self was in the place of that. Apollinarius
Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi ab Ecclesia Catholica dissenserunt, dicen-
tes sicut Ariani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In questione testi-
monii Evangelicis vis, mentem qua rationalis est anima hominis, non fuisse in ani-
ma Christi, sed pro hac ipsum Verbum in ea fuisse dixerunt. This was then the
clear difference betwixt the Arian and Apollinarian Heresy. Apollinarius quidem
carnis & animæ naturam sine mente assumpsisse Deum credunt, Ariani vero carnis
tantummodo. Facundus l. 9. So that two things are to be observed in the Apollina-
rians, their philosophy and their Divinity; their Philosophy in making man consist
of three distinct parts, the body, the soul, and the mind; their Divinity in making the hu-
mane nature of Christ to consist but of two, the body and the soul, and the third to be
supplied by the Word. Which is excellently expressed by Nemesius, de Nat. Hom.
in respect of his Philosophy. Τινὲς μὲν, ὡς ἐστὶ καὶ Πλάτωνος, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν,

Thus

καὶ ἄλλον πνεῦν δογματίζαντες, ὅτι τειῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ζωοποιεῖν βούλοντες, σώματα, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ νῦ. Οἷς ἡκολούθησεν καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος ὁ τῆς Λαοδικαίας γινόμενος ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν καὶ πατέρα τὸν θεοῦ τῆς οἰκίας δόξης, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ περὶ καθήκοντος κατὰ τὸ οἰκονομικὸν δογμα. and by Theodoret in respect of his Divinity, Σαρκοθῆναι δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἔφησεν λόγον, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀνελήφота ἐτὴν λογικὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀλογον, ἢ φυσικὴν, ἢ γενεωτικὴν, τινὲς ὀνομάζουσι. τὸν δὲ πνεῦν ἄλλο τι εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι λέγον, ἐκ ἔφησεν ἀνελήφота, ἀλλὰ ἀρχαίως τὴν θείαν φύσιν εἶς τὸ πληρῶσαι τὸν νῦ τὴν χεῖραν.

Thus the whole perfect and complete nature of man was assumed by the Word, by him who was *conceived and born* of a woman, and so made a man. And being the Divine nature which he had before, could never cease to be what before it was, nor ever become what before it was not; therefore he who was God before by the Divine Nature which he had, was in this Incarnation made man by that humane nature which he then assumed. And thus this third Article from the conjunction with the second, teacheth us no lesse, then the two natures really distinct in Christ incarnate.

For if both natures were not preserved complete and distinct in Christ, it must be either by the conversion and transubstantiation of one into the other, or by commixtion and confusion of both into one. But neither of these wayes can consist with the Person of our Saviour, or the Office of our Mediatour. For if we should conceive such a mixture and confusion of substances as to make an union of natures, we should be so farre from acknowledging him to be both God and Man, that thereby we should professe him to be neither God, nor Man, but a Person of a nature as different from both, as all mixt bodies are distinct from each element which concures unto their composition. Besides we know there were in Christ the affections proper to the nature of man, and all those infirmities which belong to us, and cannot be conceived to belong to that nature of which the Divine was but a part. Nor could our humanity be so commixed or confounded with the Divinity

† Absit ita credere, ut conflati quodam genere duas na-

turas in unam arbitremur redactas esse substantiam, hujusmodi enim commixtio partium utriusque corruptio est. Deus enim qui capax est non capabilis, penetrans non penetrabilis, implens non implebilis, qui ubique simul totus, & ubique diffusus est per infusionem potentiae suae, misericorditer naturae mixtus est humanae, non humanae naturae naturae est mixta divinae. *Leporius Libel. Emend.*

* Teste Episcopo Inst. Theolog. l. 4. c. 8.

ty of our Saviour, but that the Father had been made man as much as the Son, because the divine nature is the same both of the Father and the Son. Nor ought we to have so low an esteem of that infinite and independent being, as to think it so commixed with, or immersed in the creature.

Again, as the confusion, so the conversion of natures is impossible. For first, we cannot with the least shew of probability conceive the divine nature of Christ to be transubstantiated into the humane nature; as those whom they call * *Flandrian Anabaptists* in the Low Countreys at this day maintain. There is a plain repugnancy even in the supposition, for the nature of man must be made, the nature of God cannot be made, and consequently cannot become the nature of man. The immateriall, indivisible, and immortall Godhead cannot be divided into a spirituall and incorruptible soul, and a carnall and corruptible body, of which two humanity consisteth. There is no other Deity of the Father then of the Son, and therefore if this was converted into that humanity, then was the Father also that man, and grew in knowledge, suffered, and died, and for three dayes there was no living God. We must not therefore so farre stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, *The * Word was made flesh*, as to destroy the propriety both of the *Word* and of the *flesh*.

* In that proposition ὁ λόγος ἦν σὰρξ ὁ λόγος there hath been

strange force used by men of contrary judgements, and for contrary ends, as to the word ὁ λόγος. The Socinians endeavouring to prove, it can have no other sense then simply *fruit*, the word was *flesh*. These Flandrian Anabaptists stretching it to the biggest sense of *factum est*. The *Word* was made *flesh*. It is confessed that the verb

Secondly,

word in the use of the Greek language is capable of either interpretation: it is also acknowledged that the most ancient Interpreters were divided in their renditions. For the Syriack rendered it מלתא בשרא נוח. Et verbum caro suit. The Ancient Latine, Et Verbum caro factum est. It cannot be denied but in the Scriptures it hath been used indifferently in either sense. And the same old Vulgar Translation in some places renders it, as the Syriack does here. Mat. 10. 16. ζῆναι ὡς ὄφεις, Ekote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes, and 25. Ἀρχαὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ὡς ὁ διδασκαλὸς αὐτῶν, Sufficit discipulo ut sit sicut magister ejus. From whence 'tis evident that they placed not the force in the signification of the word ζῆναι, but in the circumstance of the matter in which 'twas used. Howsoever neither of these interpretations prove either of these opinions; for if it be acknowledged that the word was flesh, and it hath been already proved, and presupposed by S. John in his precedent discourse, that the word had a former being antecedent to his being flesh; it followeth, that He which was before the word, and was not flesh, if after he were flesh, must be made such. And so the Socinian observation falls. Again, if he which was made flesh was the word, and after he was made such was still the word, as certainly he was, and is still the same; then his being made or becoming flesh, can no way evacuate that nature in which he did before subsist. And so the Flandrian interpretation is of no validity.

Secondly, we must not on the contrary invent a conversion of the humane nature into the divine, as the *Eutychians* of old did fancy. For sure the Incarnation could not at first consist in such a conversion, it being unimaginable how that which had no being should be made by being turned into something else. Therefore the humanity of Christ could not at the first be made by being the Divinity of the Word. Nor is the Incarnation so preposterously expressed, as if the flesh were made the Word, but that the Word was made flesh. And if the manhood were not in the first act of Incarnation converted into the divine nature, as we see it could not be, then is there no pretence of any time or manner in or by which it was † afterward so transubstantiated. Vain therefore was that old conceit of *Eutyches*, who thought the Union to be made

† This was the proper opinion of Eutyches, as appeareth by his own confes-

son in the Council of Chalcedon. Ὁμολογῶ ὅτι δύο φύσεων ἡγανῆδες τὴν Κθεῖον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ. Act. 1. Two distinct natures he confessed at first; but when the union was once made, he acknowledged but one. But when that union was made he expressed not; nor could his fol-

so

lowers agree, some attributing it to the conception, some to the resurrection, others to the Ascension. Howsoever when they were united, his opinion clearly was, that the humane nature was so absorpt into the divine, so wholly made the same, that it ceased wholly to be what it was, and so there was but one, that is the divine nature remained. This is sufficiently expressed by S. Leo who was the strongest opposer of him, and speaketh thus of his opinion. Ser. 8. de Nativ. Hic autem recentioris sacrilegii profanus assertor, unionem quidem in Christo duarum confessus est naturarum; sed ipsa unione id dixit effectum, ut ex duabus una remaneret, nullatenus alterius existente substantia. And the Eranistes in the Dialogue of Theodoret disputing in his name, being urged to declare whether in that union one nature was made of them both, or one remaining the other did not so; Answered plainly, Ἐγὼ τὴν διότητα λέγω μόναν ἵκάναι, καταποθῆναι δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.

so in the natures, that the humanity was absorpt and wholly turn'd into the Divinity, so that by that transubstantiation the humane nature had no longer being. And well did the Ancient Fathers, who oppos'd this Heresy, make use of the Sacramentall union between the bread and wine, and the body and blood of Christ, and thereby shewed, that the humane nature of Christ is no more really converted into the divinity, and so ceaseth to be the humane nature; then the substance of the bread and wine is really converted into the substance of the body and blood, and thereby cease to be both bread and wine. From whence it is by the way observable, that the Church in those dayes understood no such doctrine as that of

* There can be
no time in
which we may

* Transubstantiation.

observe the Doctrine of the Ancients so clearly, as when they write professedly against an Heresy evidently known, and make use generally of the same Arguments against it. Now what the Heresy of Eutyches was, is certainly known, and the nature of the Sacrament was generally made use of as an Argument to confute it. Gelasius Bishop of Rome hath written an excellent book against Eutyches De duabus naturis in Christo. In which he propoundeth their opinion thus. Eutychiani dicunt unam esse naturam, id est, divinam. And sola existente Deitate, humanitas illic esse jam desinit. That then which he disputes against, is the Transubstantiation of the humane nature into the divine. The Argument which he makes use of against it, is drawn from the Eucharist. Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod & per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ: & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certe imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis eviden-

Being

ter ostenditur, hoc nobis ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus, & sumus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet, in divinam transiens; S. Spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanentes tamen in sua proprietate naturæ, sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter representant, ex quibus constat propriè permanentibus, unum Christum quia integrum verumque permanere demonstrant. In which words 'tis plain he affirms the union of the Humane nature of Christ to be the principall mystery, the representation of that mystery to be in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; he concludes from thence, that as in the representation, the substance of the bread and wine remaineth in the propriety of their own nature, so the humane nature of Christ in the greater mystery doth still remain. In the margin of this place in the Bibliotheca Patrum there is printed Cautè, as if there could be any danger in observing the sense of the Fathers, when they speak so expressly and considerately. In the same manner we find a Disputation between an Heretick and a Catholick in the second Dialogue of Theodoret, where Eranistes as an Heretick asks Orthodoxus, by what name he calls the bread and wine after consecration, who answers, the Body and Blood of Christ: From whence Eranistes argues, Ὁμοῦ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τῷ δεσποτικῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ αἵματι, ἅλλα μὲν εἰσὶ περὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπικλησιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερον γίνεται, ἕτοιμ τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, οἷς τὴν ἑστέραν μετεβλήθη τὴν θελήαν. As the Symbols of the body and blood of Christ are one thing before consecration, and after that change their name and become another, so the body of Christ after his ascension is changed into the divine substance. To this Orthodoxus answers, Ἐὰν οὖν αἱ εἰρηγες ἀρχίζον. You are taken in your own netts. Οὐδέ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἀγιασμόν τὰ μυστικὰ Σύμβολα τῆς οὐκ ἐκείνης οὐσίας, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ ὁμοῦ, καὶ δεσπὶς ἐστὶ καὶ ἀπὸ, εἷς καὶ πρῶτον ἦν. The bread and wine even after consecration leave not their own nature, but remain in their former substance, shape, and form. In the same manner, καὶ οὕτως τὸ σῶμα τὸ μὲν πρῶτον εἶδὲν ἔχει καὶ ὅμοιον καὶ ὁμοῦ, καὶ ἀπαξάπλως οἰοῖν, τὴν τῷ Σώματι οὐσίαν. The body of Christ hath the same form, figure and shape, and indeed the same bodily substance. And when Eranistes still object, that the bread is called the body and not bread, Orthodoxus answers that he is mistaken. Οὐ γὰρ σῶμα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρτοῦ ζῶντος ὀνομάζεται, ὥπως αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος περιηγήραυσεν, καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ σῶμα θεῶν ὀνομάζομεν σῶμα. For it is not onely called the body, but also bread of life, and the body it self we call the divine body. Who sees not then that Theodoret believed no more that the bread is converted into the body, than that the body is converted into the divinity of Christ? Who perceives not that he thought the bread to be as substantially and really bread after the consecration, as the body of Christ is really a body after his ascension? The same Argument is used by S. Chrysostome upon the same occasion. Against the Apollinarians in his Epistle ad Caesarium, not yet published in Greek, and by Ephraïmus in Photii Bibliotheca against the Eutychians. As therefore all the μεταμορφώσεις of the Sacrament all elements maketh them not cease to be of the same nature which before they were, so the humane nature of Christ joyned to the divine looses not the nature of humanity, but continueth with the Divinity as a substance

in it self distinct, and so Christ doth subsist not onely ex but in duabus naturis, as the Council of Chalcedon determined against Eutyches.

Being then He which is *conceived* was the *only Son of God*, and that *only Son* begotten of the substance of the Father, and so alwayes subsisted in the divine nature; being by the same conception he was made truly man, and consequently assum'd an humane nature; being these two natures cannot be made one either by commixtion or conversion, and yet there can be but one Christ subsisting in them both, because that only Son was he which is conceived and born; it followeth, that the Union which was not made in the nature, was made in the person of the Word: that is, it was not so made, that out of both natures one onely should result; but onely so, that to one Person no other should be added.

Nor is this Union only a scholastick speculation, but a certain & necessary truth, without which we cannot have one Christ, but two Christs, one Mediatour, but two Mediatours; without which we cannot joyn the second Article of our Creed with the third, making them equally belong to the same person; without which we cannot interpret the sacred Scriptures, or understand the History of our Saviour. For certainly He which was before *Abraham*, was in the dayes of *Herod* born of a woman; He which preached in the dayes of *Noah*, began to preach in the reign of *Tiberius*, being at that time about thirty yeares of age; He was demonstrated the Son of God with power, who was the seed of *David* according to the flesh; He who died on the Crosse, raised him from the dead who died so, being *put to death through the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit*; He was *of the fathers according to the flesh*, who was *God over all blessed for ever*. Being these and the like actions and affections cannot come from the same nature, and yet must be attributed to the same person; as we must acknowledge a diversity of natures united, so must we confesse the identity of the Person.

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Rom. 9. 5.

in whom they are conjoynd, against the ancient
Herefy of the † *Nestorians*, condemned in the Council
of *Ephesus*.

† This Heresy
doth most for-
mally contra-
dict these

words of the Creed, because it immediately denies this truth, that the eternall Son of God was conceived and born. And in vain did Nestorius seek not only to avoid it in the Nicene Creed, but to make use of the words of the Creed even against the Unity of the Person of Christ. S. Cyril had well objected the series, order and consequence of that Confession. Ἐφ' ἣ ἀρχῇ καὶ μεγάλῃ Συνόδῳ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ φύσιν υἱὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐν Θεῷ ἀληθινῷ Θεῷ ἀληθινόν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ φωτός, τὸν δι' ἧ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν ὁ Πατὴρ, κατεβῆναι, σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ὑποσχεθῆναι, παθεῖν, ἀναστῆναι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀναλθῆναι εἰς οὐρανόν. The strength of this objection lies in this, that Christ the onely-begotten Son, begotten of the Father before all worlds, was incarnate. The answer of Nestorius was in this manner. Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμεῖς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ σκόπητον ὅπως Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, καὶ μονογενὴς, καὶ υἱὸς πρότερον πάντων, τὰ καινὰ τῆς θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς θεμελίως, ὀνόματά. τότε τὴν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, καὶ τὴν πάθος, καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασις ἐποικοδομοῦσι ἑαυτοῦ. And the strength, or rather the weaknesse thereof is this: that first the Council placed the name of Jesus, Christ, and the onely-begotten Son, names common to the divinity and humanity of Christ, and then upon them built the doctrine of his Incarnation. Whereas it is evident that, supposing the onely-begotten a terme common to the humanity and divinity, yet the Council clearly expounds it of the eternall generation, adding immediately, begotten of his Father before all worlds; neither is there any word between that exposition and the Incarnation, but such as speak wholly of Christ as God. Therefore that onely-begotten Son, who was begotten of his Father before all worlds, descended from heaven and was incarnate. Thus S. Cyril in his second Epistle to Nestorius, and Nestorius in his second to him. Which mistake of his seemes yet more strange to me, when I consider in the same Epistle of Nestorius that fundamentall truth asserted, which of it self sufficiently, nay fully, confutes his Heresy. For he acknowledgeth the name Christ to be ἀπαθὴς καὶ ἀδιήνητος ὡς εἰς ἐν μοναδικῷ προσώπῳ θεωρουμένων σωματικῶν, and consequently Christ himself to be a single Person in a double nature, possible and impossible: which once granted, it evidently followeth, that he which was born from eternity was also born in time, for by those severall natures, he had those severall natures; that he which was impossible as God, might and did suffer as man, because the same Person was of an impossible and a possible nature, impossible, as God, possible, as man. Wherefore by that which Nestorius hath confessed, and notwithstanding that which he hath objected, it is evident out of the Nicene Creed, that the Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, was incarnate, and made man; and as evident out of the Apostles Creed, especially expounded by the Nicene, that the same onely-begotten Son was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary.

BY THE HOLY GHOST.

HAVING thus dispatch'd the consideration of the first Person concerned in this Article, and the actions contained in it so farre as distinctly from the rest they belong to him, we descend unto the other two concerned in the same, and first to him whose operation did precede in the conception, the Holy Ghost. Which second part some may think to require a threefold consideration, first, of the conception, secondly, of the person, thirdly, of the operation. But for the person or existence of the Holy Ghost, that is here onely mentioned obliquely, and therefore to be reserved for another Article where it is propounded directly. And for the Conception it self, that belongeth not so properly to the Holy Ghost, of whom the Act cannot be predicated. For though Christ was *conceived by the Holy Ghost*, yet the Holy Ghost did not conceive him, but said unto the Virgin, *thou shalt conceive*. There remaineth therefore nothing proper and peculiar to this second part, but that operation of the Holy Ghost in Christ's conception, whereby the Virgin was enabled to conceive, and by virtue whereof Christ is said to be *conceived by him*.

Luk. 1. 31.

Now when we say the Conception of our Saviour was wrought by the operation of the Spirit, it will be necessary to observe, first, what is excluded by that attribution to the Spirit; secondly, what is included in that operation of the Spirit.

For the first of these, we may take notice in the salutation of the Angel, when he told the blessed Virgin she should conceive and bring forth a son, she said *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* by which words she excludeth first all men, and then her self; all men by that assertion, *I know not a man*, her self by the question, *how shall*

Luk. 1. 34.

shall this be, seeing it is so? First, our *Melchizedeck* had no father on earth, in generall, not any man, in particular, not *Joseph*. 'Tis true *his mother Mary was espous'd to Joseph*, but 'tis as true, *before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*. We read in *S. Luke*, that the parents brought the child *Jesus* into the Temple, but these Parents were not the Father and Mother, but as it followeth, *Joseph and his Mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him*. 'Tis true *Philip* calleth him *Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph*, and which is more, his Mother said unto him, *Behold, thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing*. But this must be onely the reputed father of Christ, he being onely *as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the Son of Eli*. Whence they must needs appear without all excuse, who therefore affirm our Saviour to have been the proper son of *Joseph*, because the Genealogy belongs to him, whereas in that very place where the Genealogy begins, *Joseph* is called the supposed Father. How can it then therefore be necessary Christ should be the true son of *Joseph*, that he may be known to be the son of *David*, when in the same place where it is prov'd that *Joseph* came from *David*, it is denied that Christ came from *Joseph*? And that not onely in *S. Luke* where *Joseph* begins, but also in *S. Matthew* where he ends the Genealogy. *Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ*. Howsoever then the Genealogies are describ'd, whether one belong to *Joseph*, the other to *Mary*, or both to *Joseph*, it is from other parts of the Scriptures infallibly certain, not onely that Christ descended lineally from *David* according to the flesh, but also that the same Christ was begotten of the Virgin *Mary*, and not by *Joseph*.

Secondly, as the Blessed Virgin excluded all mankind, and particularly *Joseph*, to whom she was then espoused, by her assertion, so did she exclude her self by the man-

Mat. i. 18.

Luk. 2. 27.

Lu. 2. 33.

Job. 1. 45.

Lu. 2. 48.

Lu. 3. 23.

Mat. i. 16.

Indred in our

translation

whom may re-

late to both as

well as one, and

to Joseph as

well as Mary,

but in the Ori-

ginall it evi-

dently belongs

to Mary. τὸν

Ἰωσήφ τὸν

ἀνδρα Μαρί-

ας, ὃς ἦν ἐξαρ-

νῆν Ἰωσὴφ.

Gen. i. 18.

Luk. i. 37.

Luk. i. 35.

ner of the question, shewing that of her self she could not cause any such conception. Although she may be thought the *root of Jesse*, yet could she not germinate of her self; Though *Eve* were the mother of all living, yet generation was founded on the divine benediction which was given to both together: For *God blessed them and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth.* Though Christ was promised as the *seed of the woman*, yet we must not imagine that it was in the power of woman to conceive him. When the Virgin thinks it impossible she should conceive, because she knew not a man, at the same time she confesseth it otherwise as impossible, and the Angel acknowledgeth as much in the satisfaction of his answer, *For with God nothing shall be impossible.* God then it was who immediately and miraculously enabled the blessed Virgin to conceive our Saviour; and while *Mary, Joseph*, and all men are denied, no person which is that God can be excluded from that operation.

But what is included in the conception by the Holy Ghost, or how his operation is to be distinguished from the conception of the Virgin, is not so easily determined. The words by which it is expressed in Scriptures are very generall: first, as they are delivered by way of promise, prediction, or satisfaction to *Mary*, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee*; secondly, as they suppose the conception already past, *when his Mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*; and give satisfaction unto *Joseph*, *Fear not to take to thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost.* Now being the expressions in the Scriptures are so generall, that from thence the operation of the Spirit cannot precisely be distinguished from the concurrence of the Virgin, much lesse shall we be able exactly to conclude it by that late distinction made

made in this Article, *conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin*. because it is certain that the same Virgin also conceived him, according to the prophecy, *thou shalt conceive and bear a son*; and therefore notwithstanding that distinction, the difficulty still remains how he was conceived by the Spirit, how by the Virgin. Neither will any difference of * Propositions be sufficient rightly to distinguish these operations. Wherefore there is no other way to bound or determine the Action of the Holy Ghost, but

* *As conceptus de Spiritu S. natus ex Maria Virgine.*

S. Aug. indeed hath delivered a distinction between De and Ex, after this manner, (speaking to these words of the Apostle, Quoniam ex ipso, & per ipsum, & in ipso sunt omnia, Ex ipso non hoc significat quod de ipso. Quod enim de ipso est, potest dici ex ipso, non autem omne quod ex ipso est, recte dicitur de ipso: Ex ipso enim cœlum & terra, quia ipse fecit ea; non autem de ipso, quia non de substantia sua. Sicut aliquis homo si gignat filium, & faciat domum; ex ipso filius, ex ipso domus; sed filius de ipso, sicut domus de terra & ligno. De Nat. Boni, adv. Manich. c. 27. This distinction having no foundation in the Latine tongue, is ill made use of for the illustration of this Article, because in the Greek language of the Testament there is no such diversity of Propositions; for as we read of Mary $\text{ἐκ τῆς ἐκκενῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς}$, so also of the Holy Ghost, $\text{ἐκ τῆς ἐκκενῆς ἡ χροὸν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου}$, and $\text{τὸ ἐκ κεκενῆς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐκκενῆς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου}$. It is therefore said as well $\text{ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου}$ as ἐκ Μαρίας . Again, the Vulgar observeth no such difference, as rendering for the one de qua natus est Jesus, and for the other in utero habens de Spiritu S. Correspondently in the Greek Creeds $\text{ἐκ κεκενῆς ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου}$, $\text{ἐκ κεκενῆς ἐκ Μαρίας}$, or as in the Nicene, $\text{ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου}$ & Μαρίας . And the Latine nat only de Spiritu S. ex Maria Virgine, but sometimes de Sp. S. & Maria Virgine, and de Maria Virgine. Chrysol. and S. Aug. often de Trinitate. Wherefore in vain have the Schools first accepted of S. Augustines distinction, and then applied it to Christs conception; first taking the preposition de to signifie no lesse then a procession from the substance of the cause, and then acknowledge Christ so begotten of the Holy Ghost, because the eternall Son who was so begotten, was of the same substance with the Holy Ghost. Thus Thomas Aquinas has delivered the subtilty. Sum. p. 3. q. 32. a. 2. In Spiritu S. duplex habitudo consideratur respectu Christi. Nam ad ipsum Filium Dei qui dicitur esse conceptus, habet habitudinem consubstantialitatis; ad corpus autem ejus habet habitudinem causæ efficientis. Hæc autem præpositio De utramque habitudinem designat sicut cum dicimus hominem aliquem esse de suo patre. Et ideo convenienter dicere possumus Christum esse conceptum de Sp. S. hoc modo quod efficientia Sp. S. referatur ad corpus assumptum, consubstantialis vero ad personam assumptam. But this distinction of consubstantiality and effective causality can make nothing for the propriety of the Phrase; for the Proposition De signifieth the material

by;

cause as well as the efficient, it must do so in respect of that which is the effect; if require that the thing which is made, be made of the substance of that *de quo est*, then must Christ according unto that which is made, be made of the substance of the Holy Ghost; or to speak in the words of the Scripture, *Quod in ea natum est, de Spiritu Sancto est*. Where either that which was conceived in the Virgin must be acknowledged of the substance of the Holy Ghost, or else the Preposition *De* must not be taken in S. Augustine's sense. Howsoever being there is but one Preposition in common to both in the Originall Greek; being the Vulgar Translation useth *De* indifferently for either; being where they have distinguished *De* and *Ex*, they have attributed *Ex* which doth not signifie consubstantiality, to the Virgin, of whom they confesse he did assume the substance of his body; and *De*, which signifieth, (as they say consubstantiality) to the Holy Ghost, of whose substance he received nothing: it followeth, that the difference in the Prepositions can no way declare the different concurrence of the Spirit and the Virgin in Christ's conception.

Joh. i. 13.

by that concurrence of the Virgin which must be acknowledged with it. For if she were truly and properly the Mother of Christ, (as certainly she was, and we shall hereafter prove) then is there no reason to deny to her in respect of him, whatsoever is given to other mothers in relation to the fruit of their wombe; and consequently, no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, then what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a Mother. When the Scripture speaketh of Regeneration, or the second birth, it denieth all which belongeth to naturall procreation, describing the sons of God as begotten not of blouds, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God: And in the incarnation of our Saviour, we remove all will or lust of the flesh, we deny all will of man concurring, but as the blouds in the language of the Hebrews did signifie that substance of which the flesh was formed in the wombe, so we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ, that he was made of the substance of his Mother.

But as he was so made of the substance of the Virgin, so was he not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget him by any communication of

his

his essence, therefore he is not the Father of him, though he were conceived by him. And if at any time I have said, Christ was begotten by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin *Mary*, if the Ancients speak as if he † generated the Son, it is not so to be understood, as if the Spirit did perform any proper act of generation, such as is the foundation of paternity.

Again, as the Holy Ghost did not frame the humane nature of Christ out of his own substance, so must we not believe that he formed any part of his flesh of any other substance then of the Virgin. For certainly he was of the Fathers according to the flesh, and was as to that truly and totally the son of *David* and of *Abraham*. The *Socinians*, who will acknowledge no other way before Christ's conception by which he could be the Only-begotten Son of God, have been forced to invent a strange conjunction in the nature of Christ: one part received from the Virgin, and so consequently from *David*, and from *Abraham*, from whom that Virgin did descend; another † framed by the Spirit, and conjoynd with it: by the one part of which humanity he was the son of man, as by the other part he was the son of God.

† *As Chrysológus Serm. 57. Ubi Spiritus generat, Virgo parturit, totum divinum geritur, nihil humanum. & Serm. 62. Stupenti mundo solus aperit quid est, quod Spiritus generat, Virgo concipit, Virgo parit.*

† *Deus ipsemet ad sanguinem Mariae addidit aliam materi-*

am, ex quibus deinde Christus conceptus & natus est. Smalcus De veto & Naturali Dei Filio, c. 2. Verum manet generationem & hanc dici posse, quatenus in Deum ea cadere potest, si ad sanguinem Mariae addita sit ex parte Dei materia, ex qua cum sanguine Mariae juncta natus sit Christus. Ib. c. 3. What this was thus added to the substance of the Virgin, he elsewhere explaines: Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis uterum aliquam substantiam creatam vel immisisse aut ibi creasse affirmamus, ex qua, juncto eo quod ex ipsius Virginis substantia accessit, verus homo generatus fuit. This he doeth not onely, without any authority, affirm, but ground upon it the Sonship of Christ. For so it follows, Alias enim homo ille Dei Filius a conceptione & natiuitate proprie non fuisset. And again, Necessitas magna fuit ut Christus ab initio vitæ suæ esset Deo Filius, qualis futurus non fuisset, nisi ei virtute aliquid creatum fuisset, quod ad constituendum Christi corpus una cum Mariae sanguine concurreret. Thus while they deny the eternall generation of the Son, they establish a temporall in such manner as is not consonant with that word which they pretend wholly to follow, and have made a body of Christ partly descending from the Father, partly not: and whereas as man he is like to us in all things, son onely excepted,

they have invented a body partly like ours, partly not, and so in no part totally like. Indeed some of the Ancients did speak so as to make the Holy Ghost the semen Dei: as Tertullian; Ergo jam Dei filius ex Patris Dei semine, i. e. Spiritu, ut esset hominis filius, caro ei sola erat ex hominis carne sumenda sine viri semine. Vacabat enim viri semen apud habentem Dei semen. De carne Christi c. 18. And S. Hilary calls it Sementivam ineuntis Spiritus efficaciam, l. 2. de Trin. But in this they onely understood the Operation of the Spirit, loco seminis. And whosoever spake of any proper semen, they abhor'd; as appears by the 191 Sermon de Tempore. Nec, ut quidam sceleratissimi opinantur, Spiritum S. dicimus pro semine fuisse, sed potentia & virtute Creatoris operatum. I know not whether be the greatest folly; to make the Holy Ghost the Father, as these men have done, by creating part of his body by way of seminall conjunction; or to make the same Spirit Mother of Christ, as the Nazareans did. In Evangelio Hebræorum quod leſſitant Nazaræi, Salvator inducitur loquens, *Modo me arripuit Mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.* There is onely this difference, that one is founded upon no authority of Scripture, the other upon the authority of a pretended, but no Scripture: the one maketh the H. Ghost a partiall, the other a totall mother.

The belief of this is necessary to prevent all fear or suspicion of spot in this Lamb, of sin in this Jesus. Whatsoever our originall corruption is, howsoever displeasing unto God, we may be from hence assured there was none in him, in whom alone God hath declared himself to be well-pleased. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?* saith Job; a clean and undefil'd Redeemer, out of an unclean and defiled nature? He whose name is holiness, whose operation is to sanctifie, the Holy Ghost. Our Jesus was like unto us in all things, as born of a woman; sin onely excepted, as *conceived by the Holy Ghost.* This originall and totall sanctification of the humane nature was first necessary to fit it for the personall union with the Word, who out of his infinite love humbled himself to become flesh, and at the same time, out of his infinite purity, could not defile himself by becoming sinfull flesh. Secondly, the same sanctification was as necessary in respect of the end for which he was made man, the redemption of mankind: that as the † first Adam was

† Illud unum peccatum, quod tam magnum in loco & habituantæ felicitatis admissum est, ut in uno homine originaliter, atque, ut ita dixerim, radicaliter totum genus humanum damnaretur, non sol-

vikur ac diluitur, nisi per unum Mediatorem Dei & hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, qui solus potuit ita nasci, ut ei opus non esset renasci. S. Aug. Ench. c. 48.

the

the fountain of our impurity, so the second *Adam* should also be the pure fountain of our righteousness. God sending his own son in the likeness of sinfull flesh, condemned sin in the flesh; which he could not have condemned, had he been sent in sinfull flesh. The Father made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him; which we could not have been made in him, but that he did no sin, and knew no sin. For whosoever is sinfull wanteth a Redeemer, and he could have redeemed none, who stood in need of his own redemption. We are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ: therefore precious, because of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot. Our atonement can be made by no other high Priest, then by him who is holy, harmlesse, undefiled, and separate from sinners. We cannot know that he was manifested to take away our sins, except we also know, that in him is no sin. Wherefore, being it is so necessary to believe the originall holiness of our humane nature in the person of our Saviour, it is as necessary to acknowledge that way by which we may be fully assured of that sanctity, his conception by the Holy Ghost.

Again, it hath been * observed, that by this manner of Christ's conception is declared the freedome of the grace of God. For as the Holy Ghost is God, so is he also called the gift of God: and therefore the humane nature in its first originall, † without any precedent merit, was

Rom. 8.3.

2 Cor. 5. 21.

1 Pet. 2. 22.

1 Pet. 1. 19.

Heb. 7. 26.

1 Jo. 3. 5.

In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum. Nam si esset in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret. S. Aug.

* By S. Augustine. Ex hoc, quod de Sp. S. est secundum hominem nat.

vitas Christi, quid aliud, quam ipsa gratia, demonstratur? Ench. c. 37. † Modus iste quo natus est Christus de Sp. S. non sicut filius, & de Maria virgine sicut filius, insinuat nobis gratiam Dei, qua homo nullis præcedentibus meritis, in ipso exordio naturæ suæ quo esse cœpit, verbo Dei copularetur in tantam Personæ unitatem, ut idem ipse esset filius Dei qui filius hominis, & filius hominis qui filius Dei: ac sic in humanæ naturæ assumptione fieret quodammodo ipsa gratia naturalis, quæ nullum peccatum posset admittere. Quæ gratia propterea per Sp. S. fuerat significanda, quia ipse proprie sic est Deus, ut etiam dicatur Dei Donum. Id. c. 40.

Luk. 1, 78.

Tit. 3. 4.

* Cum ad naturam Dei non pertineat natura humana, ad personam tamen unigeniti Filii Dei per gratiam pertinet humana natura; & tantam gratiam, ut nulla sit major, nulla prorsus æqualis. Neque enim illam susceptionem hominis ulla merita præestserunt, sed ab illa susceptione merita ejus cuncta coeperunt. S. Aug. Tract. 82. in *Johan.* a *Joh.* 1. 13.

† Bā gratiā sic ab initio fidei suæ homo quicumque Christianus, quā gratiā homo ille ab initio suo factus est Christus. De ipso Spiritu & hic renatus, de quo est ille natus. Eodem Spiritu fit in nobis remissio peccatorum, quo Spiritu factum est ut nullum haberet ille peccatum. S. Aug. de Prædest. Sanct. c. 15. || Nolite desperare; quod semel natum est ex *Maria*, quotidie & in nobis nascitur. Hiero. Comm. in *Psal.* 84. 17.

formed by the Spirit, and in its formation sanctified, and in its sanctification united to the Word: so that the grace was coexistent, and in a manner connaturall with it. The Mystery of the Incarnation is frequently attributed in the Scriptures to the love, mercy, and goodnesse of God. *Through the tender mercy of our God the day spring from on high hath visited us.* In this the kindnesse and love of God our Saviour toward man appear'd. And though these and such other Scriptures speak properly of the love of God and mercy to man alone, offer'd unto him in the Incarnation of our Saviour, and so directly exclude the merits of other men onely; yet because they speak so generally with reference to Gods mercy, they may well be thought to exclude all merit universally. Especially considering the impossibility of * merit in Christ's humanity, in respect of his conception; because all desert necessarily precedeth its reward, and Christ was not man before he was conceived, nor can that merit which is not.

Thirdly, whereas we are commanded to be holy, and that even as he is holy: by this we learn from what fountain this holinesse must flow. We bring no such purity into the world, nor are we sanctified in the wombe: but as He was sanctified at his conception, so are we at our regeneration. He was conceived not by man, but by the Holy Ghost; and we are *a born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* The same overshadowing power which formed his humane nature, reformeth ours; and the † same Spirit assureth us a remission of our sins, which caus'd in him an exemption from all sin. He which was born for us upon his incarnation, is born || within us upon our regeneration.

All which considered, we may now render a clear explanation of this part of the Article, whereby every person may understand what he is to professe, and expresse what is the Object of his Faith, when he saith, I believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*. For hereby he ought to intend thus much; I assent unto this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that the onely-begotten Son of God, begotten by the Father before all worlds, very God of very God, was conceived and born, and so made man, taking to himself the humane nature, consisting of a soul and body, and conjoyning it with the divine in the unity of his person. I am fully assured that the Word was in this manner made flesh, that he was really and truly conceived in the wombe of a woman, but not after the manner of men; not by carnall copulation, not by the common way of humane propagation, but by the singular, powerfull, invisible, immediate operation of the Holy Ghost, whereby a Virgin was beyond the law of nature enabled to conceive, and that which was conceived in her was originally and completely sanctified. And in this latitude I professe to believe in Jesus Christ, *which was conceived by the Holy Ghost*.

BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

THe third Person considerable in this third Article is represented under a threefold description, of her Name, Condition, and Action. The first telleth us who it was, it was *Mary*; the second informeth us what she was, a *Virgin*; the third teacheth us what she did, she conceived and bare our Saviour, and brought forth the Son of God: *which was born of the Virgin Mary*.

The Evangelist relating the Annuntiation, taketh particular notice of this name: for, shewing how an Angel was

Lu. i. 27.

sent unto a *Virgin espoused to a man*, he first observeth that his name was *Ioseph*, and then that the *Virgins name* was *Mary*. Not for any peculiar excellency in the name it self, or any particular application to the Virgin arising from the origination of it, † as some have conceiv'd; but onely to denote that singular person, which was then so well known to all men, being espoused unto *Ioseph*, as appeareth

† For some have thought the dignity of the Virgin to be denoted in

her name. As Greg. Nyss. (or rather his Interpolator) Hom. in Natal. Christi: Επὶ δὲ ἐτέχθη τὸ παιδίον, ἀνόμασε μὲν αὐτὴν Μαρίαν, ὡς αὐτὴ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐκονίας τὸ θεόδοτον διασημανθεῖν τῆς χάριτος. Mistaking, as I conceive, the origination of Mary for that of Anna, her mother, ΠΠ. Thus he thought Grace, others Dominion, to be contained in her name. Ἡ Μαρία ἐρμηνεύεται κυρία, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐλπίς. Κύριον γὰρ ἔτεκε τὴν ἐλπίδα τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ Χριστόν. Author Hom. de Laud. B. Mariæ, sub nomine Epiphani. Τίτλος τοῖς πατρὶσι ἡ χάρις (τὸ γὰρ Ἄννα ἐρμηνεύεται ἡ χάρις) τὸ γὰρ σημαίνει τῆς Μαρίας τὸ ὄνομα. Damasc. Orthod. Fid. l. 4. c. 15. S. Hieron. de Nom. Hebraicis, Sciendum quod Maria sermone Syro Domina nuncupatur. So chrysologus, Dignitas Virginis annunciat ex nomine. Nam Maria Hebræo sermone, Latine Domina nuncupatur. Vocat ergo Angelus Dominam, ut dominatoris genitricem trepidatio desereret servitutis, quam nasci & vocari Dominam ipsa sui germinis fecit & impetravit autoritas. Serm. 142. Ser-mone Syro Maria Domina nuncupatur, & pulchre, quia Dominum genuit. Isidor. Hispal. Orig. l. 7. c. 10. The same Isidore with others gives another Etymology. Maria illumina-rix, five stella maris, genuit enim lumen mundi. And Bernard. Homil. 1. super Missus est, Loquamur pauca & super hoc nomine, quod interpretatum maria stella dicitur, & matri Virgini valde convenienter aptatur. Ipsa namque aptissime syderi comparatur: quia sicut sine sui corruptione sydus suum emittit radium, sic absque sui læsione Virgo parturit filium. So farre not amisse. But when from a bad Etymology he makes worse Divinity, calling her the Starre of Jacob, and attributing unto her the light of our minds, the life of our graces, and extirpation of our vices, (the work of the Spirit of Christ) when in the midst of all our temptations, horrors of conscience, and depths of despaire, he adviseth us immediately to a Respice Stellam, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca; his interpretation can warrant no such devotion. This etymology also descendeth from S. Hierome, who in his Interpretation of the names in Exodus, as from Philo, Maria illuminatrix mea, vel illuminans eos, aut smyrna maris, vel stella maris. And again on the names in S. Matthew, Mariam plerique existimant interpretari, illuminant me isti, vel illuminatrix, vel smyrna maris; sed mihi nequaquam videtur. Melius autem est ut dicamus sonare eam Stellam maris, five amarum mare. Ερμηνεύεται γὰρ καὶ ἡ Μαρία Σμύρνα θαλάσσης. Homil. de Lau-dibus B. Mariæ. Licet sunt & ante Mariæ multæ: nam & Maria filia Aaron dicta fuit, sed illa Maria amaritudo maris voc batur. S. Ambros. In Tit. V rg. c. 5. Indebet ab amaritudine, without the adjection of mare, is the Etymology observed by

the Jewes, as appears by the Author of the Life of Moses, who relating how Amram took Iocbed to wife, and of her begat a daughter, addeth, ותקרא שמרה מרי כי בעת ההיא החלו המצריי בני חם למרור חיי בני ישראל she was called Miriam, because at that time the Egyptians, who were the offspring of Cham, made the lives of the Sons of Israel bitter. And in the like manner Seder Oram, נקרא שמרה מרי על שם מרור.

by the question of his admiring countrymen, *Is not this Mat. 13, 55.*
the Carpenters Son? *Is not his Mother called Mary? O-*
therwise the name was common even at that time to
many; to the sister of *Lazarus*, to the mother of *James* *Io. 11, 1.*
and *Ioses*, to the wife of *Cleophas*, to the mother of *Iohn* *Matt. 27, 56.*
whose surname was *Mark*; to her which was of *Magdal* *Io. 19, 25.*
in Galilee, to her who bestowed much labour on *S. Paul.* *Act. 12, 12.*
Nor is there * any originall distinction between the name *Luk. 8, 2.*
of these and of the Mother of our Lord. For as the name *Ro. 16, 6.*
* *This is to be*
observed, by
reason of some

learned men, who make the name of the Virgin different from that of others called Mary in the Gospel, upon two grounds, in respect of the accent, and the termination; the one being *Μαριάμ*, the other *Μαρία*; the first with an Hebrew termination, indeclinable, and the Accent in ultima, the latter with a Greek termination, declinable, and the Accent in penultima. As, *ἡ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ*, *Lu. 15, 27.* in the nominative; *ἀπογένη ἰσραὴλ σὺν Μαριάμ*, *Lu. 2, 5* in the Dative; *μὴ φοβῆθης παραλαβεῖν Μαριάμ*, *Mat. 1, 20.* in the Accusative; *ὅτι μὴ φοβῆ*, *Μαριάμ*, *Lu. 1, 30.* in the Vocative case. All which belong to the Virgin, who is never nam'd *Μαρία*: as none of the rest by any of the Evangelists is ever called *Μαριάμ*. But notwithstanding this observation, we find the same Virgin's name declined: as *μνηστειόσιν τῆς μητρός αὐτῆς Μαρίας*, *Mat. 1, 16.* and *ὡς γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίας τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, both which must come from the Greek termination *Μαρία* in recto. And on the contrary, that Mary which *S. Paul* mentioneth hath the same Hebrew termination with the Virgin, *ἀνδράδε Μαριάμ ἥ τις πολλὰ ἠκούσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς*, *Ro. 16, 6.* Beside, the Syriac Translation makes no difference between the name of these and of the Virgin; as *מרם מנוליתא ומרים אמה דעקוב* *Mar. 15, 40.* So again *מרם מנוליתא ומרים אחרת* *Mat. 28, 1.* And therefore there can be no sufficient foundation for any such distinction.

of *Iesus* was the same with *Iosuah*, so this of *Mary* was the same with * *Miriam*. The first of which name re- * For whereas
me first read
Ex. 13, 20. *הנביאה מרים* the LXX. translate it, *Μαριάμ ἡ παροῦσιν*, and the
corded

Vulgar Lat. Miris prophetissa. The Hebrew first was מִרְיָם *Mirjam*; the Syriac altering the pronunciation, not the letters, מַרְיָם *Marjam*, as for מִרְיָם מַרְיָם. And because the Greek language admitteth no *Fod* Consonant, they pronounc'd it *Μαριδαμ*. Though sometimes indeed even the Greeks did use the barbarous pronunciation in the barbarous words, as *Lucian* with the *Latines* makes *Ἰουδαῖον* of three syllables.

Again, because no Greek word endeth in *μ*, to make it currant in that language, it was necessary to alter the termination, according to their custome; as for *Annibal* Ἀννίβα, *Aldrubal* Ἀλδρῦβα, *Amilcar* Ἀμίλκα, and *Kaiv* Κάϊν. This may be done sometimes by addition, as Νῶχ Νῶχον, Ἀβὲλ Ἀβελον, Ἀμύχ Ἀμύχον, Ἰσραὴλ Ἰσραήλ, Ἑνὼς Ἑνώσον, Σὴθ Σήθον, Ἀδὰμ Ἀδάμ, Ἀβραὰμ Ἀβραάμ, & Ἀβραάμης. And so for *Μαριαμ*, *Μαριδάμ*, or *Μαριδάμην*, *Iosephus*, *Μαριδάμ τὴ πατρὸς ἀδελφὴ*, of *Miriam* the Sister of *Moses*; whom in another place he calls ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ *Μαριδάμην*. Therefore he thought the name of *Mariamne* to be the same with *Miriam*. And as the Greeks were wont to adde their own terminations to exotick words; so did they at other times leave out the exotick terminations, if thereby their own were left. As for מִרְיָם & מִרְיָה, Ἀβία & Ἀβυα, for מִרְיָם & מִרְיָה, Ἀσὰ & Ζαζὰ, for מִרְיָם & Ζαζὰ, for *Μαριδάμ* *Μαρία*. Wherefore from the Hebrew *Miriam*, came by variety of pronunciation at first the Syriac *Marjam*; and from the Syriac *Marjam*, at first, onely by variation of pronunciation, *Μαριδάμ*, then, for the propriety of termination, *Μαρία*.

corded was the daughter of *Amram*, the sister of *Moses* and *Aaron*, a Prophetesse; to whom the bringing of *Israel* out of Egypt is attributed, as well as to her brethren. For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, saith the Lord, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants, and I sent before thee *Moses*, *Aaron*, and *Miriam*. As she was exalted to be one of them who brought the people of God out of the Egyptian bondage; so was this *Mary* exalted to become the Mother of that Saviour, who through the red Sea of his blood hath wrought a plenteous redemption for us, of which that was but a type: and even with the confession of the lowlineffe of an handmaid she seems to bear that † exaltation in her name.

† For though that Interpretation *Domina* may seem to

come conveniently enough from מַרְיָם, yet that being rather from the Chaldees, cannot so well agree with *Miriam*; nor is the *ו* so properly added at the end, as in the Be-

beginning of an Hebrew word, where it is usually in words of simple signification Heemanticall. Again, though מר may signifie Smyrna maris, or Illuminatrix, which S. Hierome rejected, and Stella (or rather stilla, which is properly מל) maris, or amarum mare, which be rather embraced; yet these compositions are not so proper, or probable at all, especially in a name dissyllable. Though the Jews themselves deduce it from מר, to signify the bitterness of the Egyptian bondage, as we read in Midrash וישע beside the two Authors before quoted, מר נקרא מרים שמרדו המצרים את חיי, yet still the addition of the small Mem is not proper, or if that should stand for מר, there were no good Account to be given of the God. Whereas if we deduce it from the Radix מר, with the addition of the Heemantick Mem, the notation is evident, and the signification clear, as of one exalted above others.

Beside this name of the blessed Virgin little hath bin discover'd to us. Christ who commended the faith of the Centurion, the love of *Mary Magdalene*, the excellencies of *John the Baptist*, hath left not the least *encomium* of his Mother. The Evangelists, who have so punctually describ'd the city, family, and genealogy of *Joseph*, make no expresse mention of her relations, onely of her *cousin Elizabeth*, who was of the tribe of *Levi*, of the daughters of *Aaron*. Although it be of absolute necessity to believe, that he which was born of her descended from the tribe of *Judah*, and the family of *David*; yet hath not the Scripture clearly expres'd so much of her, nor have we any more then an † obscure tradition of her parents *Ioachim* and *Anna*. Where-

† I call this a Tradition, because not in the written word; and obscure, because the first

Where-

monition we find of it was in the fourth Century. Epiphanius first informs us, who
 speaking of Ioseph, says he knew thus much. Γυναικα μὲν ἦσεν αὐτὴν τῇ μάτρει
 ἑθελῶσαν τῇ οὖσιν, καὶ ὃν μητρός Ἀννης καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωακείμ. Hærel. 78.
 Again, Ἐι ἀγγέλους προσκυνεῖσαι ἐθέλω, πόσω μᾶλλον τὴν ἀπὸ Ἀννης γε-
 γνημένην, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωακείμ τῇ Ἀννᾷ δειδωρημένην; Hærel. 79. Where he
 makes mention of the History of Mary, and the traditions concerning her nativity.
 Ἡ τῆς Μαρίας ιστορία, καὶ παραδόσεις ἔχουσιν, ὅτι ἐρρέθη τῷ πατρὶ αὐτῆς Ἰω-
 ακείμ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτι ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ Συνελιφεῖα, &c. VVhat this History of Mary
 was, or of what authority those traditions were, we cannot learn out of Epiphanius.
 VVhat the Interpolator of Gregory Nyssien's Homily produceth, he confesseth taken
 from Apocryphall writings, And divers of the like relations descended from the
 X x prime

prime and greatest Hereticks. The Gnosticks had a book among them, which was called *Γέννα Μαρίας*, Epiph. Hæres 25. Amongst the Moniches Seleucus wrote the History of the *Virgin*. And the Protevangelium Jacobi deceived many in relations of this nature. Among which, many being certainly false, it is not now easie (if at all possible) to distinguish what part of them or particular is true. Quod de generatione Mariz Faustus posuit, quod patrem habuerit ex tribu Levi sacerdos em quendam nomine Ioachim, quia Canon: cum non est, non me contringat, saith S. Anselm, l. 23. contra Fautum, c. 9.

Wherefore the title added to that name maketh the distinction: for as divers characters are given to severall persons by which they are distinguish'd from all others of the same common nomination, as *Jacob* is called *Israel*, and *Abraham* the friend of God, or Father of the faithfull; so is this *Mary* sufficiently characteriz'd by that inseparable companion of her name, the *Virgin*. For the full explication whereof more cannot be required, then that we shew first that the *Messias* was to be born of a Virgin, according to the prediction of the Prophets; secondly, that this *Mary*, of whom Christ was born, was really a Virgin when she bare him, according to the relations of the Evangelists; thirdly, that being at once the mother of the Son of God and yet a Virgin, she continued for ever in the same Virginitie, according to the Tradition of the Fathers, and the constant doctrine of the Church.

† Τίς ποτε, ἢ ἐν ποίᾳ γυναικὶ τετλημικα καλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα Μαρίας ἥτις ἀγίας, καὶ ἱερουργομένη ἐκ εὐθὺς ἐπιγαγε τὸ παρθένον. Ἐξ αὐτῆς γὰρ ἦν ἐπιτίτῳ ὀνομάτων καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀποφαίνεται ἀπεκμήσια. Ἀξιόματα μὲν γὰρ ὀνομασθῶν ἐλήφασιν οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐκείνῳ πρεπόντως, καὶ ὡς ἡμεῖς. Καὶ τὸ μὲν Ἀβραὰμ προστίθη τὸ, οὐλῶ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐδιαλυθήσεται τὸ δὲ Ἰακώβ τὸ Ἰσραὴλ καλεῖται, καὶ ἐκ ἀλλοιωθήσεται καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις τὸ βοανεργῆς, οὗτοι ἐν ὑπὲρ βροντῆς, καὶ ἐκ ἀποκαταλειφθήσεται καὶ τῇ ἀγίᾳ Μαρίᾳ τὸ παρθένον, καὶ ἐτελεσθήσεται, Epiph. H. r. 78.

The obdurate Jew, that he might more easily avoid the truth of the second, hath most irrationally denied the first; resolved rather not to understand *Moses* and the Prophets, then to acknowledge the interpretation of the Apostles. It will therefore be necessary, from those Oracles which were committed unto them, to shew the promised *Messias* was to be born after a miraculous manner,

to be the Son of a woman, not of a man. The first promise of him seems to speak no less, *The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpents head*: for as the name of seed is not generally or collectively to be taken for the generation of mankind, but determinately and individually for that one seed, which is Christ; so the woman is not to be understood with relation unto man, but particularly and determinately to that sex from which alone immediately that seed should come.

According to this first Evangelicall promise followed that prediction of the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man.* That new creation of a man is therefore new, and therefore a creation, because wrought in a woman onely, without a man, compassing a man. Which interpretation of the Prophet is ancient, † literall and clear, and whatsoever the Jewes have invented to elude it is frivolous and forc'd. For while they force the phrase of *compassing a man* in the latter part of the prediction to any thing else then a conception, they do not onely wrest the Scripture, but con-

† For it is not to be denyed that the proper signification of סבב is circundare, or cingere, tradidit. R. Iudab

has observed but one interpretation of this Verb כולם ענין אחד; and Kimchi testifieth, that all words which come from the root סבב signify in compassing or circuition. Therefore those words נקבה חסובב גבר must literally import no less then that a woman shall encompass or enclose a man, which with the addition of a new creation, may well bear the interpretation of a miraculous conception. Especially considering that the ancient Jews did acknowledge this sense, and did apply it determinately to the Messias: as appeareth in Bereshit Rabba Parash. 89. where shewing that God doth heal with that with which he wounde him, he saith, as he punished Israel in a virgin, so would he also heal them with a Virgin, according to the Prophet, *The Lord hath created a new thing on the earth, a woman shall compass a man.* By the testimony of R. Huna in the name of R. Idi, and R. Iosuah the son of Levi, זה מלך המשיח שנ' היום ילדתיך This is Messias the King, of whom it is written (Psalm. 2. 7.) This day have I begotten thee. And again in Midrash Tillim upon the 2. Psalm. R. Huna in the name of R. Idi speak of the sufferings of the Messias, saith that when his hour is come, God shall say, הן הוא אומר אני עלי לבראתו בריה חדשה היום ילדתיך I must create him with a new creation. And so (by virtue of that new creation) he saith, this day have I begotten thee.

X x 2

From

From whence it appeareth that this sense is of it self literally clear, and that the ancient Rabbins did understand it of the Messiah; whence it followeth that the later interpretations are but to avoid the truth which we professe, that Jesus was born of a Virgin, and therefore is the Christ,

tradict the former part of the promise, making the new creation neither new, as being often done, nor a creation, as being easie to perform.

1/. 7. 14.

† How soon these Objections were made use of by the Jewes will appear by Iustine Mar. yr, the first Writer which made any consi-

derable explication and defence of the Christian religion; who in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, shews us what were the Objections of the Rabbins:

Ἐπει δὲ ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν πολυῖα λέγετε, μηδὲ εἰρηάζετε τῇ προφητείᾳ τῆς Ἡσαΐου, ἰδὲ ἢ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, ἀλλ', ἰδὲ ἢ νεανίας ἐν γαστρὶ λά-
 λει καὶ τέξει υἱόν. And Tertullian, whose works are full of the Divinity of Iu-
 stine, Si quando ad deiciendos aliquos ab hac divina prædicatione, vel convinctos
 singulos simplices quosque gestitis, mentiri audetis, quasi non virginem, sed juven-
 lam concepturam Scriptura contineat. Advers. Iudæos c. 9. & advers. Marcionem,
 lib. 3. cap. 13. And as they soon began, so did they go on with this Objection, Hæ-
 die, toto jam credente mundo, argumentantur Iudæi, Esaiæ docente de Maria &
 virginitate ejus, Ecce virgo in utero concipiet, & pariet filium, in Hebræo juven-
 lam scriptum esse, non virginem, id est, balma, non berbula. Dicunt Iudæi, provo-
 cemus istam prædicationem Esaiæ, & faciamus comparisonem, an Christo qui
 jam venit competat illi primo nomen quod Esaias prædicavit, & insignia ejus que
 de eo nuntiavit. Equidem Esaias prædicat eum Emmanuelem vocari oportere, de-
 hinc virtutem sumpturum Danaçi & spolia Samaritæ adversus regem Assyriorum.
 Porto, inquiunt, iste qui venit, neque sub ejusmodi nomine est dictus, neque re-
 bellica functus. Tertul. adv. Judæos. || So Iustine testifieth of the Jewes, speaking
 to Trypho, and in him to them: ἔξηρχῶδε τὴν προφητείαν ὡς εἰς Ἐξελίαν Ἰδὲ
 ἡνδμενον ὑμῶν βασιλεῖα. And Trypho replies again to Iustine, ἰδὲ ὡς ἐκ-
 νοῦν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰδὲ ὑμῶν ἐκδοῦν ἀποδεδειγμένους εἰρηάζετε ἡμῶς ὡς εἰς Ἐξελίαν αὐτὸν
 ἀγορεύον περὶ προφητεῶν.

a Virgin,

a Virgin, by such || Interpreters as were Jews themselves, some hundred yeares before our Saviour's birth. And did not the notation of the word, and frequent use thereof in the Scriptures perswade it, the wonder of the *signe* given by the Lord himself would evince as much. But as for that conceit, that all should be fulfill'd in *Hezekiah*, it is so manifestly and undoubtedly false, that nothing can make more for the confirmation of our faith. For this *signe* was given, and this promise made (*A Virgin shall conceive and bear a son,*) at some time in the reign of *Abaz*. This *Abaz* reigned but sixteen yeares in *Jerusalem*; and *Hezekiah* his son who succeeded him was twenty and five yeares old when he began to reign, and therefore born severall yeares before *Abaz* was King, and consequently not now to be conceived when this *signe* was given. Thus while the ancient Jews name him onely to fulfill the prophesy, in whom it is impossible it should be fulfilled, they plainly shew that, for any knowledge which they had, it was not fulfilled till our Saviour came: and therefore they cannot with any reason deny but that it belong'd unto the *Messias*, as divers of the ancient Rabbins thought and confessed; and is yet more evident by their monstrous errour, who therefore expected † not *Messias* in *Israel*, because they thought whatsoever was spoken of him to have been completed in *Hezekiah*. Which is abundantly enough for our present purpose, being onely to prove that the *Messias* promised by God, and expected by the people of God before and under the Law, was to be conceiv'd and born of a Virgin.

|| The LXX. Ἰδὲ ἡ παρ-
δὲν ὁ γὰρ
σεῖ ἀληθεύει.
Tis true, the
rest of the In-
terpreters, con-
curring with
the Objection
of the Jews,
translated it,
ἰδὲ ἡ νεανίς,
i. e. adolescen-
tula or juven-
cula. But as
their antiquity,
so their autho-
rity is farre
short of the
LXX. especi-
ally in this
case. I shall
not need to
shew how the
Origination of
מלך from
מלך proves na-
lesse. VVe
know the affi-
nity of the Pa-
nick tongue
with the He-
brew, and by
the testimony of
S. Hierome,

Secondly, *Lingua Ponica,*

quæ de Hebræorum fontibus manare dicitur, propriè virgo alma appellatur. a 2 Kin. 16.2. b 2 Kin. 18.2. † It is the known saying of Hillel, recorded in Sanhedrin c. chelek, משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי הוהית There is no *Messias* to the *Israel* es, because they have already enjoy'd him in the dayes of *Hezekiah*. Divers of the later Rabbins endeavour to mollifie these words of Hillel by their severall expostitions, but in vain. And R. Joseph understood him better, who thought he took away all expectation of a *Messias*, and therefore fairly pray'd for him, *Condona Domine*

hoc R. Hillel. Howsoever it appears that from two principles, whereof one was false, he gathered that false conclusion. For first, he thought those words in Isaiah were spoken of the Messiah: which proposition was true. Secondly, he conceived that those words were spoken of Hezekiah, and fulfilled in him: which Proposition was false. From thence he inferred, that the Israelites were not to expect a Messiah after Hezekiah: which Conclusion was also false.

Luke 1. 27.

Matt. 1. 18.

Verse 23.

† Hæc est Virgo quæ in utero concepit, virgoque peperit filium: Sic enim scriptum

est, *Ecce Virgo in utero accipiet, & pariet filium.* Non enim concepturam tantummodo Virginem, sed & parituram Virginem dixit. S. Ambros. Epist. 7. ad Siricium. So be argued from the Prophecy. and S. Aug. from the Creed; Si vel per nascentem corrumpereetur ejus integritas, non jam ille de Virgine nasceretur: eumque falso, quod absit, de Virgine natum tota confiteretur Ecclesia, quæ, imitans ejus matrem, quotidie

Secondly, as we are taught by the predictions of the Prophets, that a Virgin was to be Mother of the promised *Messias*; so are we assured by the infallible relations of the Evangelists, that this *Mary* the Mother of *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the Christ, was a Virgin when she bare him, when she brought forth her first-born Son. That she was a Virgin when and after she was espoused unto *Joseph*, appeareth by the narration of S. Luke: For the Angel *Gabriel* was sent from God to a Virgin espoused to a man whose name was *Joseph*. After the Salutation of that Angel, that she still was so, appeareth by her question, *How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* That she continued so after she conceived by the Holy Ghost, is evident from the relation of S. Matthew: For when she was espoused unto *Joseph*, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. That she was a Virgin not onely while she was with child, but even when she had brought forth, is also evident out of his application of the Prophecy, *Behold, a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son.* For by the same prediction it is as manifest that a Virgin should bring forth, as conceive a Son. Neither was her act of parturition more contradictory to virginity, than that former of conception.

Thirdly,

quotidie parit membra, & Virgo est. *Ezechiel*. c. 34. As also S. Ambrose in the same Epistle; Quæ potuit Virgo concipere, potuit Virgo generare; quem semper conceptus præcedat, partus sequatur. Sed si doctrinis non creditur sacerdotum, credatur oraculis Christi, credatur moniti. Angelorum, credatur Symbolo Apostolorum, quod Ecclesia Romana intemeratum semper custodit & servat. And S. Basil upon occasion of the same Prophecy; ἡ αὐτὴ γυνὴ καὶ παρθένος καὶ μητὴρ, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀγιασμῷ τῆς παρθενίας μένουσα, καὶ τὴν τῆς τεκνογονίας εὐλογίαν κληρονομοῦσα. Hom. 25.

Thirdly, we believe the Mother of our Lord to have been not onely before and after his Nativity, but also for ever the most immaculate and blessed Virgin. For although it may be thought sufficient † as to the mystery of the Incarnation, that when our Saviour was conceived and born, his Mother was a Virgin; though whatsoever should have followed after could have no reflective operation upon the first fruit of her wombe; though there be no further mention in the Creed then that he was born of the Virgin *Mary*: yet the peculiar eminency and unparalleled privilege of that Mother, the speciall honour and reverence due unto that Son, and ever paid by her, the regard of that Holy Ghost who came upon her, and the power of the Highest which overshadowed her, the singular goodnesse and piety of *Ioseph*, to whom she was espoused, have perswaded the Church of God in all ages to believe, that she still continued in the same Virginity, and therefore is to be acknowledged the **Ever-Virgin Mary*. As if the gate of the Sanctuary in the Prophet *Ezechiel* were to be understood of her, *This gate shall be shut, it shall not be open'd, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord the God of Israel hath entred in by it, therefore it shall be shut.* † Many indeed have taken the boldnesse to deny this truth, because not recorded in sacred writ; and

† Μέχρι τοῦ νῦν καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑμῶν ἀναγκαῖα ἡ παρθενία, τοῦ δ' ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπαργμότητον τῷ λόγῳ τῆς μυστικῆς καὶ λαοῦ. S. Basil. Hom. de Nativ. * For so the Greek Church always call'd her ἀειπαρθένος, and from them the Latin: Semper-Virgo.

Ezech. 44. 1.

† First we read in the time of O. i. en, hat not some did main-

tain the Virginity of *Mary* no longer then Christ's Nativity. In tantam ne cio quis prorupit infantiam, u. assere negatam fuisse Mariam à Salatore, eo quod post natiuitatem illius iuncta fuerit *Ioseph*. Hom. 7. in *Lucam*. Tertullian himself

was produced as an assertor of the same opinion; nor does S. Hierome deny it, though I think he might have done it. Apollinaris, or at least his followers, deliver'd the same, says Epiphanius; and Eunomius with his, Ἰδὲ Ἰωσήφ μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν κωφερίαν συνέθεεν ἐπερίκασι τῇ παρδίνῳ, as Photius out of Philostorgius. Not that these words in Photius were the words of Philostorgius, for he was clearly an Eunomian, and therefore would never expresse their opinions with an ἐπερίκασι. And as he alwayes commended Eunomius, so was he not commended but by an Eunomian, that is a man of his own sect. As that Epigramme,

Ἐυνομανῦ.

Ἰσορίην ἐτέλειαν οὐκ ἀρίτεον Κορησί.

which I therefore mention, because Gotofred hath made an unnecessary emendation in the Verse, ἐτέλειαν ἀδελφῶν, and a worse interpretation in the Inscription, taking the Eunomian to be a Catholick, and the name of the sect for the name of a man; and confirming this error by a greater mistake, saying Eunomianus was the name of a man, twice spoken of in Suidas, once in Ἐυνομανδῆς, and again in Ἐλυσί. 'Tis true indeed Suidas says expressly, Ἐυνομανδῆς, ὄνομα κλέριον: and immediately adds these words, Ἰδὲ δὲ Ἐυνομανδὸν ἔλασι Βελισάριος τὸ θεῖον λατρεῖν, as if Belisarius had baptized one whose name was Eunomianus. But the words are taken out of Procopius in Hist. Arcana pag. 2. from whence it appears that he who was baptiz'd was by name Theodosius, and by sect an Eunomian. And whatsoever his name was who wrote that Epigramme on the History of Philostorgius, he was certainly by sect an Eunomian, and that was intended in the Inscription, written without question by some Catholick, who thought no man could commend the History of Philostorgius but one of his own opinion. These afterwards increased to a greater number, whom Epiphanius calls by a generall name Antidicomarianitæ. And from him S. August. Antidicomarianitæ appellati sunt Hæretici, qui Mariæ virginitati usque adeo contradicunt, ut affirmant eam post Christum natum viro suo fuisse commixtam, de Hæres. condemned under that name by the sixth Generall Council, Act. 11. The same were called by the Latines Helvidiani from Helvidius, (a disciple of Auxentius the Arian,) whose name is most made use of, because refuted by S. Hierome. He was followed by Iovinian a Monk of Millan, as S. Hierome testifieth, though S. Augustine delivereth his opinion otherwise, Virginitatem Mariæ destruebat, dicens eam pariendo fuisse corruptam. And Bonosus a Bishop in Macedonia, refer'd by the Council of Capua to the judgement of Anyfius Bishop of Thessalonica, was condemned for the same, as appeareth by the 79 Epistle of S. Ambrose, written to Theophilus and Anyfius. Sane non possumus negare de Mariæ filiis jure reprehensum, meritoque vestram Sanctitatem abhorruisse, quod ex eodem utero virginali, ex quo secundum carnem Christus natus est, alius partus effusus sit. This is the Catalogue of those by the Ancients accounted Hereticks for denying the perpetuall Virginity of the Mother of our Lord.

not onely so, but to assert the contrary as deliver'd in the Scriptures, but with no successe. For though, as they object, *S. Matthew* testifieth that *Ioseph* knew not *Mary*, until she had brought forth her first-born Son; from whence they would inferre, that afterwards he knew her: yet the manner of the Scripture language produceth no such inference. When God said to *Iacob*, *b I will not leave thee untill I have done that which I have spoken to thee of*, it followeth not that when that was done he left him. When the conclusion of *Deuteronomy* was written, it was said of *Moses*, *c no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day*: but it were a weak argument to inferre from thence, that it hath bin known ever since. When *Samuel* had delivered a severe prediction unto *Saul*, he *d came no more to see him untill the day of his death*: but it were a strange collection to infer, that he therefore gave him a visit after he was dead. *e Michal* the daughter of *Saul* had no child unto *she* day of her death: and yet it were a ridiculous stupidity to dream of any midwifery in the grave. Christ promised his presence to the Apostles *untill the end of the world*, who never made so unhappy a construction as to infer from thence, that for ever after he would be absent from them. Again, 'tis * true that Christ is termed the first-born Son of *Mary*, from whence they inferre she must needs have a second; but might as well conclude, that where-soever there is one, there must be two. For in this particular the * Scripture notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it supposeth none to

a Mat. 1. 25.

† For in the word *ἔως* there is no such force. Τὸ *ἔως* ἢ πῶς ἀπὸ διαρροῦ τῆς μάλλοντι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ δὲ πῶς, τὸ μετὰ τοῦ δὲ ἢ καὶ αἰνῶν. *Nat. Orat. 2. de Filio.* Τὸ *ἔως* πολλαχῶς ἔχει μὴν πῶς ἀπὸ διαρροῦ σμὲν ὑποτακτικῶς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὸ ἀείνονος δόξαν. *S. Bas. Hom. de Nat. Dō.* Ἐδὲ τῇ χάριτι τὴν ῥῆσιν ταύτην μὴ ὅτι διὰ τὸ μέγεθος πέναι ἔχει. *S. Chrys.*

Τὸ *ἔως* πολλαχῶς ἔχει τῷ δὲ δινηκῶς ἐν τῇ θείᾳ χάριτι εὐεξοκομένη καίμενον. *Ibid. Pelus. 1. 1. Ep. 18.* Τὸ *ἔως* πολλαχῶς ἔχει ὅτι ἔχει λόγον, ἀλλ' ὅτι τῷ ἡμῶν πρῶτον. *Adria. Isag. in S. S.* Τὸ *ἔως* ὁρίσται μὲν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ ὅτι ἔχει λόγον, ὁρίσται δ' ὅτι ἐπὶ δυνάσει μεγάλων μὴ ἔχων καὶ δεοπρεπῶν, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν, ὃ μὲν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν ἔτι ἔχει πρὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐναντίον οἷς ὑποδήλωσιν ἀπ᾽ ἀντι διαστήματος. *P. n. Ep. 30.* *b Gen. 28. 15.* *c Deut. 24. 6.* *d 1 Sam. 15. 35.*

1 Sam. 6. 23.

* For I shall not deny that Christ was call'd the first-born

Y y

is

in respect of his Mother, though Epiphanius thought that a sufficient answer: ἐν δὲ πένθ' ἐγγύησι τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἔγγω αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἐγγύησι καὶ ὕδ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκ αὐτῆς, τὸν πρωτότοκον αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν πρωτότοκον. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῷ ὕψ' αὐτῆς ἐσημάνει, ὅτι αὐτῆς κατὰ Σάρα γεγενῆσθαι ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ σὺ πρωτότοκον ἐπωνυμίᾳ ἐκείνῃ τὸ αὐτῆς ἔθετο, ἀλλὰ πρωτότοκον μόνον. *Mat. 78. As if her Son the first-born were not her first-born son. Οὐ πάντως ὁ Πρωτότοκος πρὸς τὸς ἐπιγινόμενους ἔχει τὴν Σύγκεισιν, ἀλλ' ὁ πρῶτον Διακρίνον μήτηρ Πρωτότοκος ὀνομαζέσθαι.* S. Basil. *Hom. de Nativ. Primogenitus est non tantum post quem & alii, sed ante quem nullus.* S. Hieron. *adv. Helvid.* It is observed by Servius, to that of Virgil *Æneid. 1. Troja qui primus ab oris, that Primus is post quem nullus.*

† Thus S. Hierome makes his plea, Quid me in unius mensis stringis articulo? quid primogenitum vocas, quem an sequantur fratres ignoro? Expecta donec nascitur secundus: nihil deo facerem, nisi & ille fuerit procreatus, per quem is qui ante natus est incipiat esse primogenitus. *Adv. Helvid.*

have gone before, but concludeth not any to follow after. Sanctifie unto me, saith God, all the first-born; which was a firme and fixed law, immediately obliging upon the birth: whereas if the first-born had included a relation to a second, there could have bin no present certainty, but a suspension of obedience; nor had the first-born bin sanctified of it self, but the second birth had sanctified the first. And well might any † sacrilegious Jew have kept back the price of redemption due unto the Priest, nor could it have bin required of him, till a second offspring had appear'd, and so no redemption at all had bin required for an onely son. Whereas all such pretences were unheard of in the law, because the Originall * Hebrew word is not capable of any such construction, and in the Law it self it carrieth with it a clear interpretation, a Sanctify unto me all the first-born; whatsoever openeth the wombe among the children of Israel both of man and beast it is mine. The aperture of the wombe * determineth the first-born; and the law of redemption excludeth all such tergiversation, saying, b Those that are to be redeemed, from a month old thou shalt redeem; no staying to make up the relation, no expecting another birth to perfect the redemption. Being

* בכורים. a *Exod. 13. 2.*
 * D. finivit sermo Dei quid sit Primogenitum; omne, inquit, quod aperit vulvam.
 S. Hieron. *adv. Helv.* b *Numb. 18. 16.*

Being then they brought our Saviour to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord; it is evident he was called the first-born of Mary according to the notion of the law of Moses, and consequently that title inferreth no succession, nor pro- veth the Mother to have any other offspring.

Indeed, as they thirdly object, it cannot be denied but that we read expressly in the Scriptures of the brethren of our Lord, *He went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren*: and while he talked unto the people, *his mother and his brethren stood without desiring to speak with him*. But although his Mother and his brethren be nam'd together, yet they are never called the sons of his Mother; and the question is not whether Christ had any brethren, but whether his Mother brought forth any other children. 'Tis possible Ioseph might have children before Mary was espoused to him; and then, as he was reputed and called our Saviour's father, so might they well be accounted and call'd his brethren, as the † ancient Fathers, especially of the Greek Church, have taught. Nor need we thus assert that Ioseph had any offspring, because the language of the Jewes includeth in the name of brethren not onely the strict relation of fraternity, but also the larger of consanguinity; and therefore it is sufficient satisfaction for that expression, that there were such

Luke 2. 22, 23.

Jo. 2. 12.

Mat. 12. 46.

† Origen first delivereth it on S. Mat. and Eusebius sheweth his opinion, speaking of S. Iames the Brother of our Lord, Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 1.

Τότε δὴ τα καὶ Ἰακώβον καὶ τὴν Κλεῖαν λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ ἕτος ἰω-
σηφ ὀνόμαζο πάντες, τὴν δὲ Χεῖσαν πατὴρ ὁ Ἰωσήφ. So we read, as it is
set forth by R. S. Stephan. But in my book collated with an ancient MS. ὅτι
δὴ καὶ ἕτος ἕως ἦν τὴν Ἰωσήφ, τὴν νομιζομένην οἶον πατρός τὴν Χριστῶν.
which is much more plain, for ὀνόμαζο πάντες is nothing so pertinent in this
particular, as ἕως ἦν. So Epiphanius, Ἦν γὰρ ὁ Ἰακώβος ἕτος ἕως τὴν Ἰωσήφ
καὶ γυναικὸς τὴν Ἰωσήφ, ἐκ ἀπὸ Μαρίας. Hæc. 1. 29. and Hæc. 42. speaking
of the rest, he calls them τὰς ἕως Ἰωσήφ καὶ τῆς οὕτως αὐτῆς ἄλλης γυναικός.
Thus S. Hilary, Homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinionis suæ auctoritatem,
Y y 2 quod

quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse sit traditum, quasi Mariæ illi fuissent, & non potius Ioseph ex priore conjugio suscepti. *Com. in Matth. cap. 1.* Thus also S. Ambrose de Virg. and generally all the Fathers to that time, and the Greeks afterward, S. Chrys. S. Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and Nicephorus. These all seem to have followed an old Tradition which is partly still continued in Epiphanius, Επεὶ δὲ ἔτι ὁ Ἰωσήφ τὴν μὲν πρώτην αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα· καὶ κύττει αὐτῷ αὐτὴ παῖδας τὸν αἰθμον ἕξ, τίτας αὐτῶν ἀρρενας, θηλείας δὲ δύο. *Ἡγ. 78.* The first of these six children was James: μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ γίνεσθαι πάντας Ἰωσήφ καλούμενον, ἅτα μετ' αὐτὸν Συμεὼν, Ἰσάκ, Ἰούδας· καὶ δύο θυγατέρες, ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη καλούμενη. Thus had the Greeks a distinct relation of the sons and daughters of Ioseph, and of the order of their generation, whose authority I shall conclude with that of Iobius Oeconomi. l. 9. Ἐκεῖ πατέρας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάσαι τὸν ἀπατορα, ὡς ἐκ τῶν ληστῶν καὶ πορνῶν τέκνους ἐξελήξατο, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ διαλαμπόντων· τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ οἱ τέττα παῖδες. Phot. Biblioth. 222. And that of Anphilochius Junior, Orat. in Deip. Ἡπίσιος δὲ ποτε καὶ οἱ τῷ Ἰωσήφ ὕδικοι, καθὼς μαρτυρεῖ ὁ Εὐαγγελιστὴς, καὶ τῇ πέρᾳ διδάχοντες τὸ ἀληθὲς, γεγραφήκασιν Ἰάκωβ καὶ Ἰούδας παῖδες τοῦ κόσμου, οἱ καὶ Κλεῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλους ἐαυτοὺς εἶναι.

- persons allied unto the blessed Virgin. *We be brethren,*
Gen. 13. 8. said *Abraham* unto *Lot*; when *Abraham* was the son of *Terah*, *Lot* of *Haran*, and consequently not his brother, but his nephew, and, as elsewhere properly stiled, the son of his brother. *Moses* called *Mishaël* and *Elzaphan* the sons of *Vzziel* the uncle of *Aaron*, and said unto them, *Come neer, carry your brethren from before the Sanctuary*; whereas those brethren were *Nadab* and *Abihu*, the sons
Gen. 29. 12. not of *Vzziel*, but of *Aaron*. *Iacob* told *Rachel* that he was her fathers brother, and that he was *Rebeka's* son; whereas *Rebeka* was the sister of *Rachel's* father. It is sufficient therefore that the Evangelists, according to the constant language of the Jewes, call the kindred of the blessed Virgin the brethren and sisters of her onely son; which indeed is something the † later, but the most generally approved Answer.

† The first, I conceive, who return'd this

answer, was S. Hierome, in a Treatise written in his youth at Rome against Helvidius; wherein after a long discourse of severall acceptions of Brethren in the Scriptures, he thus concludes; Restat igitur ut fratres eos inteligas appellatos cognatione,

non affectu, non gentis privilegio, non natura: quomodo Lot Abrahæ, quomodo Iacob Laban est appellatus frater. *And as for the other opinion of those which went before him, he saies was grounded meerly upon an Apocryphal History. Com. in Mat. cap. 12. Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Ioseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quandam Escham mulierculam confingentes. In deed Origen himself, followed in this particular by the Greek Church, did confesse no lesse, who tells the Authors from whom that interpretation first arose, Fratres autem Iesu putabant nonnulli esse, ex traditione Hebræorum sumpta occasione, ex Evangelio quod titulum habet juxta Petrum, aut ex libro Iacobi, filios Ioseph ex priore uxore, quæ convixerat ipsi antequam duceret Mariam, in Mat. 13. 55. This Iacobus mentioned by Origen is the same with him whom Eustachius mentions in Hexamero. Ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἰσοπλῆν ἢν διέδοικεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγίας Μαρίας Ἰδαυβός, ἡ ἰταυθὴν, where he reckons Ioseph inter τῶν χηρῶν υἱας: and Epiphanius calls Ἰδαυβός, Ἐβραῖος. S. Hierome therefore observing that the former opinion of Ioseph's sons was founded meerly upon an Apocryphal writing, and being ready to assert the Virginity of Ioseph as well as Mary, first intended the other solution in the kindred of Mary, as founded not onely in the language but also testimony of the Scriptures. Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Ioseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta Apocryphorum, & quandam Escham mulierem confingentes. Nos autem, sicut in libro quem contra Helvidium scripsimus continetur, fratres Domini non filios Ioseph, sed consobrinos Salvatoris, Mariæ liberos intelligimus matris Domini, quæ esse dicitur mater Iacobi minoris & Ioseph & Iudæ, quos in alio Evangelii loco fratres Domini legimus appellatos. Fratres autem consobrinos dici omnis Scriptura demonstrat. S. Hieron. in Matth. 12. 49. After S. Hierome S. Aug. embraced this Opinion. Consanguinei Virginis Mariæ, fratres Domini dicebantur. Erat enim consuetudinis Scripturarum appellare fratres quoslibet consanguineos & cognationis propinquos, In Ioh. Tract. 28. item Tract. 10. & contra Faustum l. 2. 35. Although therefore he seem to be indifferent, in his Exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, Iacobus Domini frater, vel ex filiis Ioseph de alia uxore, vel ex cognatione Mariæ matris ejus debet intelligi: yet because this Exposition was written while he was a Presbyter, and those before mentioned after he was made a Bishop, therefore the former was taken for his undoubted opinion, and upon his and S. Hierome's authority hath bin generally since received in the Latine Church.*

And yet this difficulty, though usually no further considered, is not fully clear'd; for they which impugned the perpetuall Virginity of the mother of our Lord, urged it further, pretending that as the Scriptures called them the brethren of Christ, so they also shewed them to be the sons of Mary the mother of Christ. For first, the Jews ex-

Mat. 13. 55.

From this place Helvidius argued, Hæc eadem vocabula in alio loco nominari, & eodem esse fratres Domini, filios Marix, S. Hi. r. adve. f. Helv. And from the next he concluded, Ecce Jacobus & Ioses, filii Marix, quos Iudæi

fratres appellarunt.

a Mat. 27. 56. b Mark 16. 1. † Here Helvidius exclaiming triumphed, Quam miserrum erit & impium de Maria hoc sentire, ut cum aliæ foeminae curam sepulchræ habuerint, matrem ejus dicamus absentem!

Jo. 19. 25.

Mat. 27. 56.

Mark 15. 47.

Mat. 28. 1.

presse them particularly by their names, *Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James and Ioses and Simon and Judas?* Therefore James and Ioses were undoubtedly the brethren of Christ, and the same were also unquestionably the sons of *Mary*: For among the women at the crosse we find *a Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Ioses.* Again, this *Mary* they think can be no other then the mother of our Lord, because they find her early in the morning at the Sepulchre, with *b Mary Magdalene and Salome*; and it is not † probable that any should have more care of the body of the son then the mother. She then who was certainly present at the Crosse, was not probably absent from the Sepulchre. Wherefore they conclude, she was the mother of Christ, who was the mother of James and Ioses the brethren of Christ.

And now the urging of this Argument will produce a greater clearness in the solution of the question. For if it appear that *Mary* the mother of James and Ioses was different and distinguish'd from *Mary* the Virgin, then will it also be apparent that the brethren of our Lord were the sons of another mother, for James and Ioses were so called. But we read in *S. Iohn*, that *there stood by the Crosse of Iesus his mother, and his mothers sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.* In the rest of the Evangelists we find at the same place *Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Ioses*; and again at the sepulchre *Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary*; wherefore that other *Mary* by the conjunction of these testimonies appeareth to be *Mary* the wife of *Cleophas*, and the mother of James and Ioses; and consequently James and Ioses

Ioses the brethren of our Lord were not the sons of *Mary* his mother, but of the other *Mary*, and therefore call'd his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that other *Mary* was the sister of his mother.

Notwithstanding therefore all these pretensions, there can be nothing found to raise the least suspicion of any interruption of the ever-blessed *Mary's* perpetuall Virginity. For as she was a Virgin when she conceived, and after she brought forth our Saviour, so did she continue in the same state and condition, and was commended by our Saviour to his beloved disciple as a mother onely now of an adopted son.

Sicut in sepulchro ubi positum est corpus Domini, nec antea nec postea

et mortuus jacuit : sic uterus Mariæ nec antea nec postea quicquam mortale suscepit, S. Aug. in Joh. Tract. 28.

The third Consideration belonging to this part of the Article is how this Virgin was a mother, what the foundation was of her maternall relation to the son of God, what is to be attributed unto her in this sacred nativity beside the immediate work of the power of the Highest, and the influence of the Holy Ghost. For we are here to remember again the most ancient forme of this Article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*; as also that the word *Born*, was not taken precisely for the Nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his humane generation: and when afterward the conception was attributed to the Spirit, the Nativity to the Virgin; it was not so to be understood, as if the Spirit had conceiv'd him, but the blessed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit.

γεννηθέντα.

* Tantum ad
nativitatem
carnis ex se de-
dit, quantum
ex se foeminae
edendorum
corporum sus-
ceptis origini-
bus impendunt.
*S. Hil. l. 1. c. 10.
de Trin.*

First therefore, we must acknowledge a true, reall and proper conception, by which the Virgin did conceive of her * own substance the true and reall substance of our Saviour, according to the prediction of the Prophet, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive*, and the Annunciation of the

Angel,

† That is by a proper conception *Culla-*
re *fructus* *angel.* *behold, thou shalt* † *conceive in thy womb.* From
 whence our Saviour is expressly termed by *Elizabeth, the*
 † *fruit of her womb.*

the Syriac
in one word כולל ac si diceret ventrescere. So the LXX. translated the simple חרר
on גאסל ליהetas. As therefore *on* גאסל יחיו expresseth a proper gravitation, so
doth *on* גאסל קוללהבין a proper conception. According to that expression of Gre-
gory Nazianzine, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνδρὸς ἀνδρωπικῶς βίη, ὅτι νόμος συ-
στάσεως Ep. I. ad Gledon. ¶ Heb. ברי ברך. a Luke 1. 42.

Matt. 1, 18.

Λκ. 2, 5. Ἰσθ
ἐγκύω.

Λμ. ιη. 27. και
λίσια ἡ βασι-
σκὰς Σε.

Secondly, as she did at first really and properly conceive, so did she also nourish and encrease the same body of our Saviour once conceived, by the true substance of her own; by which *she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*, and is described going with Joseph to be taxed *being great with child*, and pronounced happy by that loud cry of the woman in the Gospel, *Blessed is the womb that bare thee*.

Luca 1. 37.

Luke 2. 6, 7.

Thirdly, when Christ was thus conceiv'd and grew in the womb of the blessed Virgin, she truly and really did bring forth her son by a true and proper parturition; and Christ thereby was properly born by a true nativity. For as we read, *Elizabeth's full time came that she should be delivered, and she brought forth a son*; so in the like simplicity of expression, and propriety of speech, the same Evangelist speaks of Mary, *the days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son*.

Wherefore from these three, a true conception, nutrition and parturition, we must acknowledge that the blessed Virgin was truly and properly the mother of our Saviour. And so is she frequently stiled the mother of Jesus

† Veri & proprii filii qui nisi absurdissimus neget vere & proprie dignum cognoscere & proprium apparet. *ibid.*

Te matrem? *Facundus l. i. c. 4.* Hoc & ad credendum difficile, & verum videbatur, utrum Deum illa Virgo genuerit: cæterum quod verum est, quicquid est ille quem genuit, nulli dignum disceptationis

fus in the language of the Evangelists, and by Elizabeth particularly the mother of her Lord, as also by the generall consent of the Church, (because he which was so born of her was God,) the † *Deipara*. ^{† This name} ^{was first in use}

Which in the Greek

church, who delighting in the happy compositions of the language, called the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκον. From whence the Latines in imitation styled her Virginem Di-
param & Dei genitricem. Meursius in his Glossary sets the Originall of this Title in the time of Justinian : Inditum hoc nomen est matri Domini ac Servatoris nostri Iesu Christi à Synodo i. Constantinopolitana tempore Justiniani, When as this was not the Originall, but the confirmation of that Title. In hac Synodo Catholice est institutum, ut Beata Maria semper-virgo Θεοτόκος diceretur: quia sicut Catholica fides habet, non hominem solum, sed vere Deum & Hominem genuit. Paul. *Wanesh. de Gestis Longobard. l. 6. c. 14.* So speaks he of the same Synod: and 'tis true, for the seventh Canon of the same runneth thus, Εἴ τις χτ' ἀναγοράν ἢ κατα-
χρηστικῶς Θεοτόκον λέγει τὴν ἀρίαν ἐνδοξον ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν ἀλλὰ μὴ κυρίως κατ' ἀλήθειαν Θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογεῖ ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνά-
θεμα ἔστω. Otherwise in this Council was but confirm'd what had bin decreed and sealed long before: and therefore Photius says thereof, Αὐτὴ ἡ Συνοδος Νεστορίου πάλιν τὰ μεταρ' ὁμοφρονούντων δόγματα εἰς τὸ παρτελὲς ἐξέθειεν, that is utterly cut off the Heresy of Nestorius which then began to grow up again. Now part of the Heresy of Nestorius was the denyall of this Θεοτόκος, and the whole was nothing else but the ground of that denyall. And therefore being he was condemned for denying of it, that Title must be acknowledged Authentick, which he denied from the time of the Council of Ephesus; in which those Fathers, saith Photius expressly, τὴν πανταρχαν καὶ ἀειπαρθένον (Χριστὸν) μὴ ἴσα κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς καλεῖσθαι καὶ ἀκουσμενὸς Θεοτόκον παρὰ δὲ δόξαν. Epist. 1. And that it was so then is manifest, because by the denyall of this was Nestorian Heresy was first discovered, not in Nestorius himself, but in his Presbyter Anastasius, who first in a Sermon magisterially deliver'd Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν καλεῖται μὴ δέος. Soc. Eccl. Hist. l. 7. c. 31. & Liberat. Breviar. c. 4. as also Evagrius and Nicephorus. Upon which words arising a tumult, Nestorius took his Presbyters privily, teaching the same doctrine constantly in the Church, καὶ πανταρχὴν τὴν λέξιν τοῦ Θεοτόκου ἐμβάλλον. And hereupon the tumult grew so great, but a generall Council for that reason was call'd by Theodosius Junior, τὴν Νεστορίου ἀρίαν Μαρίαν εἶναι Θεοτόκον ἀρνησάμενη, as Iulianian testifieth, Epist. ad V. Synod. m. In which when all things seem'd clearly to be carried against Nestorius and his faction, he hoped to have reconciled all by his feign'd acknowledgement, Ἀσγῶδον καὶ Θεοτόκον ἢ Μαρίαν, καὶ πανταρχὴν τὰ ἀντιπαρὰ Soc. l. 7. c. 34. Liberat. Brev. c. 6. It is plain then that the Council of Ephesus, which condemn'd Nestorius, confirm'd this Title Θεοτόκος: & so confirm'd it; for 'tis evident that it was before used in the Church, by the tumult which arose at the first denyall of it by Anastasius; and so confirm'd it at the same time.

because they approved the Epistles of S. Cyril, who prov'd it by the usage of those Fathers which preceded him. Where by this way it is observable, that while S. Cyril produceth nine severall Fathers so. the use of this word, and both before and after he produceth them, affirmeth that they all did use it; there are but three of them who expressly mention it, Athanasius, Antiochus and Ammon, Epist. ad Reginas. And it is something to be admired, that he should so name the other six, and recite those places out of them which had it not, when there were before him so many beside them that us'd it. As Gregory Nazianzen, ΕΙ ΤΙΣ ΕΘΕΟΤΟΧΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΜΑΡΙΑΝ ὑΠΕΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ, ΧΩΡΙΣ ΕΣΤΙ ΤΗΣ ΘΕΟΤΟΧΟΥ, Epist. ad Cledonium: and in his first Oration de Filio. Making of the difference of his generation from that of others, καὶ ὅτι τοῖς Κοῖς ἔγνωσεν Θεοτόχον παρθένον; And S. Basil affirmeth, μὴ κατὰ Νόμον φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοήν, ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένον ἢ Θεοτόχον. Hom. de Nat. Christi. And that in the time of S. Basil and S. Gregory this term was usual, appeareth by the objection of Iulian, who divided the Christians for this; God could be born of a woman; Θεοτόχον δὲ ὑμεῖς εἰ πάντες Μαρίαν καλεῖσθε. S. Cyril. tom. 6. Before both these Eusebius speaketh of Helena, who built a Church at Beblethen; Ἡ βασιλὶς ἡ θεοσεβέστατη τῆς Θεοτόκου τὴν κύνησιν μνήματι δαυμαστίᾳ καλεῖται, de vita Constant. l. 3. And before Eusebius, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, ἀπαρχὴν γένονεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὡς καὶ φορέσας ἀληθῶς καὶ ἐδοκίμησεν ἐν τῇς Θεοτόκῃ Μαρίᾳ. Epist. ad Alexand. apud Theodor. l. 1. c. 4. Before him Dionysius Alex. calls our Saviour τὸν ἀπεκδυόμενον ἐν τῇς ἀρίαις παρθένῃ καὶ Θεοτόκῃ Μαρίᾳ. Epist. ad Paulum Samosat. and speaking of the words of Isaiah, a Virgin shall conceive, Δείξουσιν ὅτι ἡ Θεοτόκος τὴν Λωδίασεν, ἢ παρθένον διλοῦσιν. Resp. ad Quæst. 5. Nay long before him Origen did not only use, but expound at large the meaning of that title Θεοτόκος, in his first come on the Epistle to the Romans, as Socrates and Liberatus testifie.

Which being a compound title begun in the Greek Church, was resolved into it's parts by the Latines, and so the Virgin was plainly nam'd the † Mother of † Although Θεοτόκος may be extended

to signifie as much as the mother of God, because τέκτων doth sometimes denote as much as γεννᾶν, and therefore is both bin translated Dei Genitrix, as well as Deipara; yet those ancient Greeks which call'd the Virgin Θεοτόχον, did not call her μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ. But the Latines translating Θεοτόκος Dei genitrix, and the Greeks translating Dei genitrix Θεοῦ μήτηρ, they both at last call'd her plainly the Mother of God. The first which the Greeks observ'd to stile her so was Leo the Great, as was observed by Ephraim Patriarch of Theopolis; whose words have bin very much mistaken by two learned men, Dionysius Petavius, and Leo Allatius, who have produced them to prove that he thought Leo Magnus was the first which ever us'd the word Θεοτόκος. A strange error this must needs appear in so great

great a person as a Patriarch, and that of the Greek Church; and indeed not imaginable, considering how well he was versed in those controversies, and how he compared the words of Leo with those of the ancient Greek Fathers, and particularly of S. Cyril. His words are these in his Epistle ad Zenobium, Πρῶτον ἐν ἀγίοις Λέων ἰδικῶς εἶπεν αὐταῖς λέξασιν, ὡς μήτηρ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγία Θεοτόκος, ὅς πρὸ αὐτῶν πατέρων διαπερυστοῖς ῥήματι μὴ τὸ τοιοῦτον: That is, Leo was the first who in plain termes call'd the Θεοτόκος, that is Mary, the Mother of God, whereas the Fathers before him spake not the same in expresse words. Petavius and Allatius have clearly mistaken the proposition, making the subject the predicate, and the predicate the subject, as if he had first call'd the mother of God Θεοτόκος, whereas he is said first to call the Θεοτόκος Mother of God, as appears by the article added to the subject, not to the predicate. But if that be not sufficient, his meaning will appear by another passage to the same purpose, in his Epistle ad Synclericum, Ὅτι μνηστὴρ Θεοῦ πρῶτον μὲν ἡ Ἐλισαβὲτ ἀνεῖπεν, ἐν οἷς λέγει καὶ πόθεν μετ' αὐτῆς, ἵνα ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου ἔλθῃ πρὸς με; σαρξίτερον δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν λέξιν περὶ Θεοῦ ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ὁ Πλάττας ἐμνήνευκε. Therefore as he took the Lord, and God to be synonymous; so he thought Elizabeth first stiled Mary the mother of God, because she call'd her the mother of her Lord, and after Elizabeth Leo was the first who plainly stild her so, that is, the mother of God. And that we may be yet further assured of his mind, he produceth the words of Leo the Pope in his Epistle to Leo the Emperour: Ἀναθεματίζω Νεκτόριον, ὁ τὴν μαριχείαν καὶ Θεοτόκον Μαρτίαν ἐχθρὸν Θεοῦ, ἀνθρώπου δὲ μόνον πιστεύων εἶναι μνηστῆρα. The sentence which he translates is this; Anathematize ergo Nestorius, qui beatam Virginem Mariam non Deum sed hominis tantummodo credidit genitricem. *Epist.* 97. c. 1. Where plain'y genitrix Dei is translated μήτηρ Θεοῦ, and Θεοτόκος is added by Ephraim out of custome to the subject, being otherwise not at all in Leo's words. It is therefore certain that first in the Greek Church they term'd the blessed Virgin Θεοτόκος, and the Latines from them, Dei genitrix, and mater Dei, and the Greeks from them again μήτηρ Θεοῦ, upon the authority of Leo, not taking notice of other Latines, who stiled her so before him.

The Necessity of believing our Saviour thus to be *born of the Virgin Mary*, will appear both in respect of her who was the Mother, and of him who was the Son.

In respect of her, it was therefore necessary, that we might perpetually preserve an esteem of her person proportionable to so high a dignity. It was her own prediction, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed; but the obligation is ours, to call her to esteem her so. If Elizabeth cried out with so loud a voice, Blessed art thou among women; when Christ was but newly conceiv'd in

2. Luke 1. 48.
Non equanda est mulieribus cunctis, quæ genuit majestatem. *Antiphona.* Benedicta es inter mulieres.
her rum.

* Absit ut
quisquam S.
Mariam divi-
næ gratiæ pri-
vilegiis, ut
speciali gloriâ
fraudare con-
tur.

† Ἡ Μαρία
ἐν τιμῇ, ὁ Κύ-
ριος προσκυνῶν.

Ἐν τιμῇ ἔσω Μαρία, ὁ ὃ Πατήρ, καὶ Υἱός, καὶ Ἅγιον
Πνεῦμα προσκυνῶν. Τὴν Μαρίαν ἡμεῖς προσκυνεῖται. Epib Hard 79.
Ἐκ καλλίστη ἡ Μαρία, καὶ ἁγία, καὶ ἁγιοποιημένη, ἀλλ' ἔκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνῶν. ib.

her wombe; what expressions of honour and admiration
can we think sufficient now that Christ is in heaven, and
that Mother with him? * Farre be it from any Christian
to derogate from that speciall priviledge granted her,
which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear
too reverend a regard unto the *Mother of our Lord*, so
long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the
Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the Primitive
Church: † Let her be honoured and esteem'd, let him be
worship'd and ador'd.

Heb. 2. 16.

In respect of him, it was necessary, first, that we might
be assured he was *made or begotten of a woman*, and con-
sequently that he had from her the true nature of man,
For he took not on him the nature of Angels, and there-
fore saved none of them, who, for want of a redeemer, are
*reserved in everlasting chains under darknesse unto the
judgement of the great day*. And man once fallen had
bin, as deservedly, so irrevocably condemned to the same
condition, but that *He took upon him the seed of Abra-
ham*. For being we are *partakers of flesh and blood*, we
could expect no redemption but by him who *likewise took
part of the same*. We could look for no Redeemer, but

Heb. 2. 14.

† Under that
notion did the
Ancient Jews
expect him, as
appeareth by the
Targum,
Cantic. 8. 1.

וְהָיָה
לָנוּ כְּאֶחָד מֵעַמֵּי
הָאֲרָצוֹת

מִכִּנְיָהּ לְכַנְשׁוֹתָם וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל לֵאמֹר לִי בֶן יִשְׂרָאֵל
עַתָּה מְבַרְכֵּנוּ. When the Messiah shall reveal himself, the sons of Israel shall say un-
to him, Thou shalt be unto us a Brother.

was born of a woman, that he might * redeem both men and women; that both sexes might rely upon him, who was of the one, and from the other.

* *Homini liberatio in utroque sexu debuit apparere. Ergo, quia*

virum oportebat suscipere, qui sexus honorabilior est, conveniens erat ut feminei sexus liberatio hinc appareret, quod ille vir de femina natus est. S. Aug. Quæst. l. 83. Nolite vos ipsos contemnere, viri, filius Dei virum suscepit: nolite vos ipsas contemnere, feminae, filius Dei natus ex femina est. Idem de Agone Christi.

Secondly, it was necessary we should believe our Saviour conceiv'd and born of such a woman, as was a most pure and immaculate Virgin. For as it behoved him in all things to be made like unto us; so in that great similitude a dissimilitude was as necessary, that he should be *without sin*. Our passeever is slain, and behold the lamb that taketh away the sinnes of the world; but the lambe of the passeever must be without blemish. Whereas then we draw something of corruption and contamination by our seminall traduction from the first *Adam*; our Saviour hath received the same nature without any culpable inclination; because born of a Virgin without any seminall traduction. Our high Priest is *separate from sinners* not onely in the actions of his life, but in the production of his nature. For as † *Levi* was in the loins of *Abraham*, and paid tithes in him, and yet Christ, though the son of *Abraham*, did not pay tithes in him, but receive them in *Melchizedec*: so though we being in the loins of *Adam*

Heb. 4. 15.

Non cum in peccatis mater ejus in utero aluit, quem Virgo concepit, Virgo peperit. S. Aug. Tract. 4. in Joh. Ergo ecce Agnus Dei. Non habet iste tradu-

may *etiam de Adam, carnem tantum sumpsit de Adam, peccatum non assumpsit. Ibid. Verbum caro factum in similitudine carnis peccata omnia nostra suscepit, nullum reatus vitium ferens ex traduce prævaricationis exortum. Joan. 4. Epist. ad Constantinam.*

† *Levi in lumbis Abraham fuit secundum concupiscentiam carnalem, Christus autem secundum solam substantiam corporalem. Cum enim sit in semine & visibilis corpulentia, & invisibilis ratio, utriusque cucurrit ex Abraham vel etiam ex ipso Adam usque ad corpus Mariæ, quia & ipsum eo modo conceptum & exortum est; Christus autem visibilem carnis substantiam de carne Virginis sumpsit, ratio vero conceptionis ejus non à semine virili, sed longe aliter ac desuper venit. S. August. de Gen. ad lit. l. 10. c. 19.*

may be all said to sin in him; yet Christ, who descended from the same *Adam* according to the flesh, was not partaker of that sin, but an expiation for it. For he which is contained in the seminall virtue of his parent, is some way under his naturall power, and therefore may be in some manner concerned in his actions; but he who is onely from him by his naturall substance, according to a passive or obedientiall power, and so receiveth not his propagation from him, cannot be so included in him as to be obliged by his actions, or obnoxious to his demerits.

Thirdly, it was necessary that we should believe Christ born of that person, that Virgin *Mary* which was espoused unto *Joseph*, that thereby we might be assured that he was of the family of *David*. For whatsoever promises were made of the *Messias*, were appropriated unto him. As the seed of the woman was first contracted to the seed of *Abraham*, so the seed of *Abraham* was next appropriated to the son of *David*. He was to be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God was to give unto him the throne of his father *David*. When *Jesus* asked the Pharisees, *what think ye of Christ? whose son is he?* they said unto him, the son of *David*. When *Herod* demanded of the chief Priests and Scribes *where Christ should be born;* they said unto him, in *Bethlehem* of *Juda*, because that was the city of *David*, whether *Joseph* went up with *Mary* his espoused wife, because he was of the house and lineage of *David*. After *John* the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, was born, *Zacharias* blessed the Lord God of *Israel*, who had raised up an horn of salvation for us, in the house of his servant *David*. The woman of *Canaan*, the blind men sitting by the way, and those other blind that followed him, cryed out, *have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David*. The very children out of whose mouths God perfected praise, were crying in the Temple, and saying, *Hosanna to the son of David*. And when the blind

Luke 1. 32.

Mat. 22. 42.

Mat. 2. 5.

Luke 2. 4.

Mat. 9. 27, 15.
22. 20, 30.

Mat. 21. 15.

blind and dumb both spake and saw, *all the people* *Matt. 21. 23.*
were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? Thus
 by the publick and concurrent testimonies of all the Jews,
 the promised *Messias* was to come of the house and line-
 age of *David*; for *God had sworn with an oath to him,* *Act. 2. 30.*
that of the fruit of his loynes according to the flesh, he
would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne. It was there-
 fore necessary we should believe that our Saviour *was* *Rom. 1. 3.*
made of the seed of David according to the flesh: of which
 we are assured, because he was born of that Virgin Mary
 who descended from him, and was espoused unto *Joseph*,
 who descended from the same, that thereby his genealogy
 might be known.

The Consideration of all which will at last lead us to a
 clear explication of this latter branch of the Article, where-
 by every Christian may inform himself what he is bound
 to professe, and being enformed fully expresse what is
 the object of his Faith in this particular, when he saith, I
 believe in Iesus Christ which was *born of the Virgin Ma-*
ry. For hereby he is conceived to intend thus much: I as-
 sent unto this as a most certain and infallible truth, that
 there was a certain woman known by the name of *Mary*,
 espoused unto *Joseph* of Nazareth, which before and af-
 ter her espousals was a pure and unspotted Virgin, and
 being and continuing in the same Virginity, did by the
 immediate operation of the Holy Ghost conceive within
 her womb the onely-begotten Son of God, and after the
 naturall time of other women, brought him forth as her
 first-born son, continuing still a most pure and immaculate
 Virgin; whereby the Saviour of the world was born of a
 woman under the law, without the least pretence of any
 originall corruption, that he might deliver us from
 the guilt of sin; born of that Virgin which was of the
 house and lineage of *David*, that he might sit upon his
 throne, and rule for evermore. And in this latitude I
 professe

professe to believe in Iesus Christ, *born of the Virgin Mary.*

ARTICLE IV.

Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried.

† Crucifixus
sub Pontio
Pilato, & se-
pultus. *Ruffin.*
in Symb. Cassi-
anus de incarn.
Domin. Cre-
dimus in eum
qui sub Pontio

Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus. *S. August. de Fide & Symb. & de Trinitat. l. 1. c. 14.* Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus. *Max. Taurin. Chrysol. Euseb. Gallie* Τὸν ὀν Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα, ταφέντα, Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus. *MSS. Armach.* And beside these a witness without exception, *Leo the Great*, Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum & sepultum, omnes etiam in Symbolo confirmur. *Epist. 10. cap. 5.* Afterwards the Passion was express'd: Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus & sepultus, *Etherius Uxam.* And the Death: Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus, & sepultus. *Author. lib. de Symb. ad catechum.* Not but both these were express'd before in the Rule of Faith by Tertullian, but without particular mention of the crucifixion. *Adv. Prax. c. 3.* hunc passum, hunc mortuum, & sepultum. And generally the Ancients did understand determinately his crucifying by that more comprehensive name of his suffering. For as *Marcellus* and *S. Cyril* have σταυρωθέντα & ταφέντα, *Eusebius* and the *Nicene Council* to the same purpose have ταφέντα onely in their Creeds. which was further enlarged afterwards by the Council of Constantinople into σταυρωθέντα, & ταφέντα.

But again, being he suffered not onely on the Crosse, being it was possible he might have bin affixed to that
cursed

curst tree, and yet not have dyed; therefore the Church thought fit to adde the rest of his sufferings, as antecedent, and his death, as consequent, to his crucifixion.

To begin then with his Passion in generall. In those words, *he suffered under Pontius Pilate*, we are to consider part as Substantiall, part as Circumstantiall. The substance of this part of the Article consisteth in our Saviours Passion, *He suffered*: the circumstance of time is added, declared by the present Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*.

Now for the explication of our Saviour's *Passion*, as distinct from those particulars which follow in the Article, more I conceive cannot be required then that we shew, *Who* it was which suffered, *How* he suffered, *What* it was he suffered.

First, If we would clearly understand Him that suffered in his full relation to his *Passion*, we must consider him both in his Office, and his Person; as Jesus Christ, and as the onely-begotten Son of God. In respect of his Office we believe that he which was the Christ did suffer; and so we make profession to be saved by faith in a suffering *Messias*. Of which that we may give a just account, First we must prove that the promised *Messias* was to suffer: for if he were not, then by professing that our Iesus suffer'd, we should declare he was not Christ. Secondly, we must shew that Iesus, whom we believe to be the *Messias*, did really and truely suffer: for if he did not, then while we prov'd the true *Messias* was to suffer, we should conclude he was not that *Messias*. Thirdly, it will be further advantageous for the illustration of this truth, to manifest that the sufferings of the *Messias* were determin'd and foretold, as those by which he should be known. And fourthly, it will then be necessary to shew that our Iesus did truely suffer whatsoever was so determin'd and foretold. And more then this cannot be necessary, to declare *Who* it was which suffered, in relation to his Office.

Mat. 9. 12.

Luc. 24. 26, 46.

Act. 17. 11.

For the first of these, that the promised *Messias* was to suffer, to all Christians it is evident; because our Saviour did constantly instruct the Apostles in this truth, both before his death, that they might expect it, and after, that they might be confirmed by it. And one part of the Doctrine which S. Paul disseminated through the world was this, *that the Christ must needs have suffered.*

Mar. 9. 12.

But because these Testimonies will satisfy onely such as already believe, and our Saviour himself did referre the disbelieving Jews to the Law and the Prophets, as those who testified of him, we will shew from thence, even from the Oracles committed to the Jews, *how it was written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things.*

† P. 171, 172.
We shew'd by
the Authority
of the Targum,
the Bereshith

The fifty third Chapter of *Esay* is beyond all question a sad, but clear description of a suffering person: *a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, oppressed and afflicted, wounded and bruised, brought to the slaughter, and cut off out of the land of the living.* But the person of whom that Chapter treateth, was certainly the *Messias*, as we have † formerly prov'd by the confession of the most ancient Jews, and may further be evidenced both from them, and from the place it self. For surely no mans soul can be made

Rabba, and the Midrash upon Ruth, and by the confession of Solomon Jarchi, and Moses Alshech, that the ancient Rabbins did interpret that Chapter of the *Messias*, which might seem a sufficient acknowledgment. But because this is the most considerable controversie between us and the Jews, it will not seem unnecessary to prove the same truth by further Testimonies. In the Talmud, Cod. Sanhedrin, to the question, what is the name of the *Messiah*? it is answer'd, *לוי* the Leper. And the reason of the name is there rendred, *לוי*, because it is spoken in this *Esay* 53. 4. Surely he hath born our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, i.e. *לוי*. and because *לוי* is used of the Leprosy Levitic. 13. 13. therefore from *לוי* they concluded his name to be a Leper, and consequently did interpret that place of the *Messias*. In the *Pesikta* it is written, *ה' בנה נשמת המשיח* God produced the soul of the *Messias*, & said unto him, wilt thou redeem my sons after 6000 years? He answered, I will. Wilt thou bear the chastisements to take away their sins? *הוא ירחיק את כל חטאתינו* as it is written Isa. 53. 4. Surely he hath born our griefs. And he answered, I will bear them with joy. Which is a clear testimony, considering the Opinion of the Jews, that all souls of men were created in the beginning, & so the soul of the *Messias* to suffer for the rest.

made an offering for our finnes, but our Saviour's: nor hath God laid on any man the iniquity of us all, but on our Redeemer. Upon no person but the *Messias* could the chastisement of our peace be, nor with any stripes could we be heal'd but his. It is sufficiently then demonstrated by the Prophet, that the suffering Person whom he describes, was to be the Christ, in that he *bare our griefs*, and *carried our sorrowes*.

This prediction is so clear, ever since the *Serpent* was to *bruise the heel* of the woman's seed, that the Jews, who were resolved to expect a *Messias* which should be onely glorious, have bin forc'd to invent another, which should suffer. And then they answer us with a distinction of their own invention; That a *Messias* was to redeem us, and a *Messias* was to suffer for us: but the same *Messias* was not both to redeem us, and to suffer for us. For they say that there are † two severall persons promised under the

name of the *Messias*: one of the Tribe of *Ephraim*, the other of the Tribe of *Judah*; one the son of *Ioseph*, the other the son of *David*; the one to precede, fight, and suffer death, the other to follow, conquer, triumph, reign, and

† So indeed the Jews expect a double *Messias*, one משיח בן יוסף *Messias the son of Ioseph*, the other משיח בן דוד *Messias the son of David*.

Messias the son of David. So the *Targum* expressly upon the Canticles 4. 5. פריקין ועתידין למפרקין משיח בר דוד ומשיח בר אפרים, Two are thy Deliverers which shall deliver thee, *Messias the son of David*, and *Messias the son of Ephraim*: and in the same manner, Chapter 7. 3. This that Paraphrast, nothing so ancient as the rest, is conceived to have taken out of the *Talmud* in *Massecheth Succa*: where cap. 5. in 'trib'd הוה ליל, God saith to *Messias the son of David*, שאל מה אתה מבקש Ask what thou wilt, (according to the second Psalm) and I will give it thee. כיון שרואה למשיח בן יוסף שנדרג, who seeing *Messias the son of Ioseph* wh. ch was slain, asked of God nothing but life. Thus from the *Talmud* and the later *Targum* the Rabbins have generally taught a double *Messias*, one the son of *David*, the other of *Ioseph*. As *Solomon Iarchi* Isa. 24. 18. Zach. 12. 10. Ezra Zach. 9. 9. Malach. 3. 1. Kimki Zach. 12. 10. whom the later Jews constantly follow. And this *Marcion* the heretick seem's to have learn'd of the Jews, and to have taught with some alteration in favour of his own opinion. Constituit *Marcion* alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus à Deo quondam ignoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium; alium, qui à Deo Creatore in restitutionem Iudaici status sit destinatus, quandoque venturus. *Tertul. adv. Marc.*, lib. 4. cap. 6.

he're to dye. If then our Saviour were a Christ, we must confesse he was a suffering *Messias*, and consequently, according to their doctrine, not a Saviour. For if he were the son of *David*, then, say they, he was never to dye: or if he ever died, he was not that *Messias* which was promised to sit upon the Throne of *David*. And while we confesse our Saviour dyed, and withall assert his descent from the house of *David*, we do, in their opinion, involve our selves in a Contradiction.

But this Distinction of a double *Messias* is far from prevailing over our belief: first, because it is in it self false, and therefore of no validity against us; secondly, because it was first invented to counterfeit the truth, and so very advantageous to us.

That it is in it self false, will appear, because the Scriptures never mention any *Messias* of the Tribe of *Ephraim*; neither was there ever any promise of that nature made to any of the sons or offspring of *Ioseph*. Beside, as we acknowledge but one Mediator between God and man, so the Scriptures never mention any *Messias* but one. Under whatsoever title he is represented to us, there can be no pretence for a double person. Whether the seed of the woman, or the seed of *Abraham*, whether *Shiloh*, or the Son of *David*, still one person promised: and the stile of the ancient Jews before our Saviour was, not they, but he which is to come. The question which was ask't him, when he profess'd himself to be the Christ, was, whether it was he which was to come, or whether they were to look for another; not that they could look for him, and for another also. The objection then was, that *Elias* was not yet come, and therefore they expected no *Messias* till *Elias* came. Nor can the difference of the *Messiah's* condition be any true reason of imagining a double person, because in the same place the Prophets speaking of the same person, indifferently represent him in either condition. Being then, by the confession of all the Jews, one *Messias* was to be

Zach. 9. 9.
Isai. 9. 6.

be the son of *David*, whom *Elias* was to precede; being by the tenure of the Scriptures there was never promise made of more Christs then one, and never the least mention of the Tribe of *Ephraim* with any such relation; it followeth that that distinction is in it self false.

Again, that the same Distinction, fram'd and contriv'd against us, must needs be in any indifferent persons judgement advantageous to us, will appear, because the very invention of a double person, is a plain confession of a twofold condition, and the different relations, which they prove not, are a convincing argument for the distinct æconomies, which they deny not. Why should they pretend to expect one to dye, and another to triumph, but that the true *Messias* was both to triumph and to dye, to be humbled and to be exalted, to put on the raggs of our infirmity before the robe of majesty and immortality? Why should they tell us of one Mediator to be conquer'd, and the other victorious, but that the serpent was to bruise the heel of the woman, and the same seed to bruise his head? Thus even while they endeavour to elude, they confirm our faith; and as if they were still under the cloud, their error is but as a shadow to give a lustre to our truth. And so our first Assertion remaineth firm, the promised *Messias* was to suffer.

Secondly. that *Jesus*, whom we believe to be the Christ, did suffer we shall not need to prove, because it is freely confessed by all his enemies. The Gentiles acknowledged it; the Jews triumphed at it. And we may well take that for granted, which is so farre from being denied, that it is objected. If hunger and thirst, if revilings and contempt, if sorrows and agonies, if stripes and buffetings, if condemnation and crucifixion be sufferings, *Jesus* suffered. If the infirmities of our nature, if the weight of our sinnes, if the malice of man, if the machinations of Satan, if the hand of God could make him suffer, our Saviour suffered. If the Annals of times, if the writings of his Apostles, if

† Those which
were called by
the Greeks Δο-
κηται, and

the death of his Martyrs, if the confession of the Gentiles,
if the scoffs of the Jews be testimonies, Iesus suffered. Nor
was there ever any which thought he did not really and
truely suffer, but † such as withall irrationally pretended
he was not really and truely man.

Φαντασiasαι, who taught that Christ was man onely putative, and came into the
world onely in phantasmate, and consequently that he did onely putative pati.
These were called Δοκηται, not from their Author, but from their opinion, that
Christ did all things onely εν Δοκήσει, in appearance, not reality. As Clemens A-
lexandrinus, Τῶν αἰρέσεων αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ λογμάτων ἰδιαζόντων προσαγορεύ-
οντο, ὡς ἡ τοῦ Δοκητῶν. Strom. l. 7. viz. οἱ Δοκῆσαι Χριστὸν περὶ ἀνθρώπου ὡς
πέλαγον. Id. l. 6. Neque in Phantasia, id est, absque carne, sicut Valentinus
asserit, neque de thesi, id est, putative imaginatum, sed verum corpus. Gennad.
de Eccl. Dogm. c. 2. Where, for de thesi, I suppose we shoul'd read Δοκήσει. The
Original of this train of Hereticks is to be fetch'd from Simon Magus, whose asserti-
on was, Christum nec venisse, nec à Iudæis quicquam pertulisse. S. Aug. de Hæres.
Wherefore making himself the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he affirmed, se in Fili-
persona putative apparuisse, and so that he suffered as the Son amongst the Jews;
ἀληθεία μὴ πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ Δοκήσει μόνον. Damasc. de Hæres. Now what
Simon Magus said of himself, when he made himself the Son, that those who followed
affirm'd of Christ. As Saturninus, who taught Christum in substantia non fuisse,
& phantasmate tantum quasi passum fuisse. Tertul. de Præsc. adv. Hæres. c. 46.
vide Epiph. mutilum, Har. 23. c. 1. And Basilides, who deliver'd, εἶναι τὸν
Χριστὸν φαντασίαν ἐν τῷ φαίνεσθαι, μὴ εἶναι ἢ ἄνθρωπον, μηδὲ Ἐξάρχα εἰληφε-
ναι.... ἔχον Ἰησοῦν φάσκον πεπονθέναι, ἀλλὰ Σίμωνα τὸν Κυρηναῖον. Epiph.
Har. 24. c. 3. A Iudæis non credunt Christum crucifixum, sed Simonem Cy-
renensem, qui angariatus sustulit crucem ejus. S. Aug. Hæres. 4. Thus the Valen-
tinians, particularly Marcus, the Father of the Marcisian Hereticks. Marcus etiam
nescio quis hæresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, & Christum non ve-
re sed putative passum asseverans. S. Aug. Har. 14. Thus Cerdon. Christum in
substantia carnis negat, in phantasmate solo fuisse pronuntiat, nec omnino pas-
sum, sed quasi passum. Tert. Præsc. c. 51. Christum ipsum natum ex foemina, ne-
que habuisse carnem, nec vere mortuum vel quicquam passum, sed simulasse passio-
nem. S. Aug. Har. 21. And the Manichees, who taught Christum non fuisse in
carne vera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus præbuis-
se; ubi non solum mortem, verum etiam resurrectionem mentiretur. Idem Har.
46. whom therefore Vincentius Lirinensis calls Phantasiæ prædicatores. cap. 20.

Thirdly, to come yet nearer to the particular acknow-
ledgment of this truth, we shall further shew that the pro-
mited *Messias* was not onely engaged to suffer for us,
but

but by a certain and expresse agreement between him and the Father, the measure and manner of his sufferings were determin'd, in order to the Redemption it self which was thereby to be wrought; and what was so resolved, was before his coming in the flesh revealed to the Prophets, and written by them, in order to the reception of the *Messias*, and the acceptation of the benefits to be procured by his sufferings.

That what the *Messias* was to undergo for us was pre-determined and decreed, appeareth by the timely acknowledgement of the Church unto the Father; *Of a truth, against thy holy child Iesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together; for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsell determin'd before to be done.* *Acts 4. 28.*

For as when the two goats were presented before the Lord, *Lev. 16. 8.* that goat was to be offered for a sin-offering upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the High priest, and then laid upon the head of the goat which was to dye: so the hand of God is said to have determin'd what should be done unto our Saviour, whose passion was typified by that sin-offering. And well may we say that the hand of God as well as his counsell determin'd his passion, because he was deliver'd by the determinate counsell and foreknowledge of God. *Act. 2. 23.*

And this determination of Gods counsell was thus made upon a Covenant or Agreement between the Father and the Son, in which it was concluded by them both what he should suffer, what he should receive. For beside the Covenant made by God with man, confirmed by the blood of Christ, we must consider and acknowledge another Covenant from eternity made by the Father with the Son: which partly is express'd by the Prophet, *If he shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his dayes;* partly by the Apostle, *Then said* *Is. 53. 10.*

Heb. 10. 7.

said I, loe I come, (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. In the condition of making his soul an offering for sin we see propounded whatsoever he suffered; in the acceptation; loe I come to do thy will, O God, we see undertaken whatsoever was propounded. The determination therefore of our Saviour's passion was made by Covenant of the Father who sent, and the Son who suffer'd.

Act. 26. 22.

And as the sufferings of the *Messias* were thus agreed on by consent, and determin'd by the counsel of God, so they were revealed by the spirit of God unto the Prophets, and by them delivered to the Church; they were involved in the types, and acted in the sacrifices. Whether therefore we consider the prophesyes spoken by God in the mouthes of men, they clearly relate unto his sufferings by proper prediction; or whether we look upon the ceremonial performances, they exhibite the same by an active representation. S. Paul's Apology was clear, that he said none other things then those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come; that Christ should suffer. The Prophets said in expresse termes that the *Messias*, whom they foretold, should suffer: Moses said so in those ceremonies which were instituted by his ministry. When he caused the Passeeover to be slain, he said that *Shiloh* was the lambe slain before the foundations of the world. When he set the brazen Serpent up in the wilderness, he said the Son of man should be lifted up upon the Crosse. When he commanded all the sacrifices for sin, he said, without effusion of blood there was no remission, and therefore the Son of God must dye for the finnes of men. When he appointed *Aaron* to go into the Holy of holies on the day of Atonement, he said Christ our High Priest should never enter through the vail into the highest heavens to make expiation for us, but by his own blood. If then we look upon the fountain, the eternall counsell of the will of God, if we look upon the revelation of that counsell, either in expresse predictions

or ceremoniall representations, we shall clearly see the truth of our third Assertion, that the sufferings of the promised *Messias* were predetermined and foretold.

Now all these sufferings which were thus agree'd, determin'd, and revealed as belonging to the true *Messias*, were undergone by that *Jesus of Nazareth* whom we believe to be the Christ. Never was there any suffering type which he out-went not, never prediction of any passion which he fulfill'd not, never any expression of grief and sorrow which he felt not. When the appointed time of his death approach'd, he said to his Apostles, *Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.* Luke 18. 31.

When he deliver'd them the blessed Sacrament, the commemoration of his death, he said, *Truly the Son of man goeth as it was determin'd.* After his resurrection, he chastised the dulness of his Disciples, who were so overwhelmed with his passion, that they could not look back upon the antecedent predictions; saying unto them, *O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffer'd these things, and to enter into his glory?* Lu. 22. 22. &c.
1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th 12th 13th 14th 15th 16th 17th 18th 19th 20th 21th 22th 23th 24th 25th 26th 27th 28th 29th 30th 31th 32th 33th 34th 35th 36th 37th 38th 39th 40th 41th 42th 43th 44th 45th 46th 47th 48th 49th 50th 51th 52th 53th 54th 55th 56th 57th 58th 59th 60th 61th 62th 63th 64th 65th 66th 67th 68th 69th 70th 71th 72th 73th 74th 75th 76th 77th 78th 79th 80th 81th 82th 83th 84th 85th 86th 87th 88th 89th 90th 91th 92th 93th 94th 95th 96th 97th 98th 99th 100th
 After his ascension, S. Peter made this profession before the Jews, who had those prophecies, and saw his sufferings; *Those things which God before had form'd by the mouth of all his Prophets that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfill'd.* Lu. 24. 25, 26.
 Whatsoever therefore was determined by the counsell of God, whatsoever was revealed by the Prophets, concerning the sufferings of the *Messias*, was all fulfilled by that *Jesus* whom we believe to be, and worship as, the Christ. Which is the fourth and last Assertion propounded to expresse our Saviour's *Pas-*
Act. 3. 18.
son in relation to his Office.

Having considered him that *suffered* in his Office, we are next to consider him in his Person. And being in all this Article there is no person expressly named, or describ'd; we must look back upon the former, till we find his de-

scription and his name. The Article immediately preceding leaves us in the same suspension; but for our satisfaction refers us to the former, where we find him named *Jesus*, and described *the onely-begotten Son of God*.

† This is that inseparabilis connexio in the creed, which Cassianus urgeth so much against Nestorius, de Incarn. l. 6.

1 Cor. 2. 8.
Act. 20. 28.
Dominum passum Symboli tenet autoritas, & Apostolus tradidit, dicens, Si enim cognovissent, nunquam gloriæ crucifixissent.
Vigil. adv.
Eutyc. l. 2.

Now this Son of God we have already shew'd to be therefore truly call'd the *Onely-begotten*, because he was from all eternity generated of the essence of the Father, and therefore is, as the eternall Son, so also the eternall God. Wherefore by the † immediate coherence of the Articles, and necessary consequence of the Creed, it plainly appeareth that the eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, *suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried*. For it was no other person which *suffered under Pontius Pilate*, then he which *was born of the Virgin Mary*; he which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was no other person then he which *was conceived by the Holy Ghost*; he which was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was no other person then *our Lord*; and that our Lord, no other then the *onely Son of God*: therefore by the immediate coherence of the Articles it followeth, that *the onely son of God, our Lord, suffered under Pontius Pilate*. That Word which was in the beginning, which then was with God, and was God, in the fulnesse of time being made flesh did suffer. For the *Princes of this world crucified the Lord of glory*; and *God purchased his Church with his own blood*. That Person which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the *Lord of glory*, and most truly *God*, took upon him the nature of man, and in that nature, being still the same Person which before he was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted fourty dayes, there was no other person hungry, then that Son of God which made the world; when he sate down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst, but he which was eternally begotten of the Father the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourg'd, there was no other person sensible of

But the perfect probation and illustration of this truth requireth first a view of the second Particular propounded, *How* or in what he *suffered*. For while we prove the Person suffering to be God, we may seem to deny the passion, of which the perfection of the Godhead is incapable, The Divine nature is of infinite and eternall happinesse; never to be disturbed by the least degree of infelicity, and therefore subject to no sense of misery. Wherefore while we profess that the Son of God did suffer for us, we must so far explain our Assertion, as to deny that the Divine nature of our Saviour suffered. For being the Divine nature of the Son is common to the Father and the Spirit, if that had bin the subject of his passion, then must the Father and the Spirit have suffer'd. Wherefore as we ascribe the passion to the Son alone, so must we attribute it to that nature which is his alone, that is the humane. And then neither the Father nor the Spirit will appear to suffer, because neither the Father nor the Spirit, but the Son alone, is man.

Whereas then the humanity of Christ consisteth of a soul and body, these were the proper subject of his passion; nor could he suffer any thing but in both or either of these two. For as the *Word was made flesh*, though the Word was not never made, (as being in the beginning God) but the flesh, that is the humanity, was made, and the Word assuming it became flesh; so saith S. Peter, * *Christ suffered for us in the flesh*. in that nature of man which he took upon him: and so God the Son did suffer, not in

[illegible]

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Adeo salva est
utriusque pro-
prietas sub-
stantia: ut &
Spiritus res
suas egerit in
illo, id est,
virtutes & o-
pera & signa;
& caro passio-
nes suas fun-

cta sit, esuriens sub Diabolo, sitiens sub Samaritide, flets Lazarum, anxius-
que ad mortem, denique & mortua est. *Tertul. advers. Prax. c. 27.*

that nature in which he was begotten of the Father be-
fore all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation
he became. For he was *put to death in the flesh, but quick-
ned in the Spirit*; suffered in the weakness of his huma-
nity, but rose by the power of his divinity. As *he was
made of the seed of David according to the flesh*, in the
language of S. Paul; so was he *put to death in the flesh*,
in the language of S. Peter: and as he was *declared to be
the son of God with power, according to the spirit of holy-
ness*; so was he *quickned by the Spirit*. Thus the pro-
per subject and recipient of our Saviour's passion which he
underwent for us, was that nature which he took from us.

Farre be it therefore from us to think that the Dei-
ty, which is immutable, could suffer; which onely hath im-
mortality, could dye. The conjunction with humanity
could put no imperfection upon the divinity: nor can
that † infinite nature by any externall acquisition be any
way changed in it's intrinsecall and essentiall perfections.
* If the bright rayes of the Sun are thought to insinuate into
the most noysome bodies without any pollution of them-
selves, how can that spirituall essence contract the least in-
firmity by any union with humanity? We must neither
harbour so low an estimation of the divine nature, as to
conceive it capable of any diminution; nor so mean esteem
of the essence of the Word, as to imagine it subject to the
sufferings of the flesh he took; nor yet so groundlesse an
estimation of the great mystery of the Incarnation, as to
make the properties of one nature mix in confusion with
the other. These were the wild collections of the

† Τὸ δὲ οὐ
ἀφάρστον, καὶ
ἀναλλοβίστον,
ἀεὶ τοῖς ἐν
ᾧ, ὡς ἑωρα-
σέμενον ἡ
ἰατρικὴ φύσει,
ἐταρ ἐν ἐκείνῃ
κατ' οἰκονο-
μίαν γίνηται.
*Greg. Nyssen.
Epist.*

* Ως ἐὰν ἡλια-
κὴ φύσις ἀφ-
θοιᾷ ἢ ἀκπ-
νὲς τὰ πάντα
πληρῶσαι, καὶ

σωμάτων νεκρῶν καὶ καθαρῶν ἐραπτόμεναι, πολὺ πλέον ἢ ἀσώματος τοῦ
Θεοῦ διώκειται ἕτ' ἀνθρώποι τὴν ἐρίαν, ὥς ἂν βλαβερὴν σωματικὴ ἀσώματος
ἐπαφωμένη, *Euseb. Demonst. Evang. l. 4 c. 13.*

This danger is there-
fore to be unfolded, because it is not generally understood. The Heresy of Arius as it

was

was condemned by the Council of Nice, is known to all. But that he made the nature of the Word to suffer in the flesh, is not so frequently or plainly deliver'd. This Phocadius, the first of the Latine Church who wrote against the Arians, chargeth them with. Duplicem hunc statum, non conjunctum, sed confusum vultis videri; ut etiam unius vestrum, id est Epistola Potami, quæ ad Orientem & Occidentem transmissa est, qua asserit carnem & Spiritu Christi coagulatis per sanguinem Mariæ, & in unum corpus reductis, passibilem Deum factum. Hoc ideo ne quis illum exco crederet, quem impassibilem satis constat. *Lib. adv. Arianos, c. 7. And again:* Non ergo sit spiritus caro, nec caro spiritus, quod isti volunt egregii Doctores, ut factus sit scilicet Dominus & Deus noster ex hac substantiarum permutatione passibilis. Ideo autem passibilem volunt dici, ne ex impassibili credatur. *cap. 8. Ματθην δὲ Ἀρειανοὶ φαντάζοντο, (carnem μόνον ὑποτιθέμενοι ἀνελθόναι τὸν Σωτῆρα, τὴν δὲ τῷ πατρὶ νόησον ὅτι τὴν ἀπαθῆ θεότητα ἀναφερόντες ἀσεβῶς. S. Athan. lib. de Incarn. Of this S. Hilary is to be understood. Sed eorum omnis hic sensus, ut opinentur metum mortis in Dei Filium incidisse, qui asserunt non de æternitate prolatum, neque de infinitate paternæ substantiæ extitisse, sed ex nullo illum qui omnia creavit effectum, ut assumptus ex nihilo sit, & corpus ex opere, & confirmatus ex tempore. Et ideo in eo doloris anxietas, ideo spiritus passio cum corporis passione. Can. 31. in Mat. Where clearly he argues against the Arians. The right understanding whereof is the onely true way to reconcile those harsh sayings of his which so troubled the Master of the Sentences, and the whole Schools ever since.*

and Apollinarian Hereticks, whom the Church hath long since silenc'd by a sound and sober assertion, that all the sufferings of our Mediatour were subjected in his humane nature.

And now the onely difficulty will consist in this, how we can reconcile the Person suffering with the subject of his passion; how we can say that God did suffer, when we profess the Godhead suffered not. But this seeming difficulty will admit an easy solution, if we consider the intimate conjunction of the divine and humane nature, and their union in the person of the Son. For † hereby those attributes which properly belong unto the one, are given

† Perindissolubilem unitatem Verbi &

carnis, omnia quæ carnis sunt ascribuntur & Verbo, quomodo & quæ Verbi sunt prædicantur in carne. *Orig. in Ep. ad Rom. Δια τὴν ἀκριβῆ ἐνότητα τῆς τε προσληφθείσης σαρκὸς καὶ τῆς προσλαβομένης θεότητος, ἀντιμερίζονται τὰ ὀνόματα. ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῆς θείας, καὶ τὸ θεῖον τῆς ἀνθρώπινης κατὰ φύσιν ἕνωσις. Greg. Nyss. Epi. ad Theoph. Χρὴ μέντοι εἰδέναι ὡς ἡ ἔνωσις καὶ πρὸς τὰ ὀνόματα. Theodor. Dial. 3.*

to the other; and that upon good reason. For being the same individuall person is by the conjunction of the nature of God and the nature of man, really and truly both God and man; it necessarily followeth, that it is true to say, *God is man*, and as true, *a man is God*: because in this particular, he which is man is God, and he which is God is man. Again, being by reason of the Incarnation it is proper to say, *God is man*, it followeth unavoidably, that whatsoever necessarily belongeth to the humane nature may be spoken of God; otherwise there would be a man, to whom the nature of man did not belong, which were a contradiction. And being by vertue of the same Incarnation it is also proper to say, *a man is God*, by the same necessity of consequence we must acknowledge, that all the essentiall attributes of the divine nature may truly be spoken of that man; otherwise there would be one truly and properly God, to whom the nature of God did not belong, which is a clear repugnancy. Again, if the properties of the divine nature may be truly attributed to that man which is God, then may those actions which flow from those properties be attributed to the same. And being the properties of the humane nature may be also attributed to the eternall Son of God, those actions or passions which did proceed from those properties may be attributed to the same Son of God, or God the Son. Wherefore as God the Son is truly man, and as man truly passible, and mortall; so God the Son did truly suffer, and did truly dye. And this is the onely true

† Called by the Schools ordinarily Communicatio idiomatum, by the ancient Greek Divines Ἀντιστοχίς, and sometimes Ἀντιστοχίς.

† communication of properties.

Not that the essentiall properties of one nature are really communicated to the other nature, as if the Divinity of Christ were passible and mortall, or his humanity of originall omnipotence, and omnipresence; but because the same God the Son, was also the Son of man, he was at the same time both mortall and eternall: mortall as the son of man, in respect of his humanity; eternall as the Son of God,

God, in respect of his divinity. The sufferings therefore of the *Messias* were the sufferings of God the Son: not that they were the sufferings of his Deity, as of which that was incapable; but the sufferings of his humanity, as unto which that was inclinable. For although the humane nature was conjoynd to the divine, yet it suffered as much as if it had been alone; and the divine as little suffer'd as if it had not been conjoynd: because each kept their respective properties distinct, without the least confusion in their most intimate conjunction. From whence at last the Person suffering is reconciled to the subject of his passion: for God the Son being not onely God, but also man, suffered, though not in his Deity, by reason of which he is truly God, yet in his humanity, by which he who is truly God is as truly man. And thus we conclude our two first disquisitions, Who it was that suffered; in respect of his Office, the *Messias*, in respect of his person, God the Son: How it was he suffered; not in his Deity, which is impassible, but in his humanity, which he assumed clothed with our infirmities.

Our next enquiry is, What this God the Son did suffer as the Son of man; not in the latitude of all his sufferings, but so farre as they are comprehended in this Article: which first prescindeth all the antecedent part by the expression of time, *under Pontius Pilate*, who was not Governour of *Judea* long before our Saviour's baptism; and then takes off his concluding passion, by adding his crucifixion and his death. Looking then upon the sufferings of our Saviour in the time of his preaching the Gospel, and especially before his death, we shall best understand them by considering them in relation to the subject or recipient of them. And being we have already shew'd his passion was wholly subjected in his humane nature, being that nature consisteth of two parts, the Soul and Body, it will be necessary to declare what he suffered in the body, what in the soul.

For

For the first, as we believe the Son of God took upon him the nature of man, of which the body is a part; so we acknowledge that he took a true and reall body, so as to become flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone. This body of Christ really and truly humane, was also frail and mortall, as being accompanied with all those naturall properties which necessarily flow from the condition of a frail and mortall body: and though now the same body exalted above the highest heavens, by vertue of it's glorification be put beyond all possibility of passion, yet in the time of his humiliation it was cloath'd with no such glorious perfection; but as it was subject unto, so it felt weariness, hunger, and thirst. Nor was it onely liable to those internall weaknesses and naturall infirmities, but to all outward injuries and violent impressions. As all our corporall pain consists in that sense which ariseth from the solution of that continuity which is connaturall to the parts of our body; so no parts of his sacred body were injuriously violated by any outward impression, but he was truly and fully sensible of the pain arising from that violation. Deep was that sense, and grievous was that pain, which those scourges produc'd, *when the plowes plowed upon his back, and made long their furrows*: the dilaceration of those nervous parts created a most sharp and dolorous sensation. The coronary thorns did not onely expresse the scorn of the imposers, by that figure into which they were contriv'd; but did also pierce his tender and sacred temples to a multiplicity of pains, by their numerous acuminations. That spear directed by an impertinent malice which open'd his side, though it brought forth water and blood, caused no dolorous sensation, because the body was then dead: but the nails which pierc'd his hands and feet, made another kind of impression, while it was yet alive and highly sensible. Thus did the Body of the Son of man truly suffer the bitterness of corporall pains and torments inflicted by violent externall impressions.

And

And as our Saviour took upon him both parts of the nature of man, so he *suffered* in them both, that he might be a Saviour of the whole. In what sense the soul is capable of suffering, in that he was subject to animall passion. Evil apprehended to come tormented his soul with fear, which was as truly in him in respect of what he was to suffer, as hope in reference to the recompence of a reward to come after and for his sufferings. Evil apprehended as present tormented the same with sadness, sorrow and anguish of mind. So that he was truly represented to us by the Prophet, as *a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief*; and the proper subject of that grief, he hath fully expressed who alone felt it, saying unto his Disciples, *My soul is exceeding sorrowfull even unto death*.

Qui suscepit animam, suscepit animæ passionem. S. Ambrosij. de Fide. l. 2. c. 3.

Is. 53. 3.

Mat. 26. 38.

We ought not therefore to question whether He suffered in his soul or no; but rather to endeavour to reach, if it were possible, the knowledge how far and in what degree he suffer'd; how bitter that grief, how great that sorrow and that anguish was. Which though we can never fully and exactly measure; yet we may infallibly know thus much, both from the expressions of the Spirit of God, and from the occasion of his sufferings, that the griefs and sorrows which he felt, and the anguish which he underwent, were most incomparably far beyond all sorrows of which any person here was sensible or capable.

The Evangelists have in such language express'd his Agony, as cannot but raise in us the highest admiration of the bitterness of that passion. *He began to be sorrowfull*, saith S. Matthew; *He began to be sore amazed*, saith S. Mark; and *to be very heavy*, say both: and yet these words in our Translation come far short of the

Mat. 26.

Mar. 14.

† The words in the Originall are three, λυ-

πνῆστις, ἐκθαμβήσας, and ἀδυνατούν. Ἀντιπῆστις, the first, is of a known and ordinary signification, but in this case it is to be raised to the highest degree of its possible

significan-

significancy, as appears by the words which follow; περιλυτός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. For as the ancient Grammarians observe, ἡ περὶ πένθους ἐκείνου δὴλοι, and again, ἡ περὶ πένθους λαμβάνεται ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπὲρ κατὰ λόγον ἐκείνου, and therefore περιλυτός of it self must signify a man possessed with an excessive grief. But beside this Greek notation, here is to be observed a reference to the words of David Psal. 42. 5. Ἰναλί περιλυτός ἦ ἡ ψυχὴ μου; ἡ πηπυωμένη. So that it doth not onely signify an excess of sorrow, surrounding and encompassing the soul; but also such as brings a consternation and dejection of mind, bowing the soul under the pressure and burden of it. And if neither the notation of the word, nor the relation to that place in the Psalms did expresse that sorrow, yet the following part of our Saviours words would sufficiently evidence it, ἕως θανάτου, it was a sorrow, which like the pangs of death compassed him, and like the pains of hell gate bold upon him, Psal. 116. 3. The second word, used by S. Mark alone, is ἐκθαμβήσας. Which with the Vulgar Latine is Pavere, but in the language of the Greeks beares a higher sense. Θάμβος ἑκπληξίς, says Etymologus: and Hesychius, Θάμβος, θῦμα, ἑκπληξίς: Gloss. Vet. Θάμβος stupor: Philoponus preserved by Eustathius Ἰλ. μ'. Θάμβος μὲν ἡ ἑκπληξίς. Θάμβος κατ' ἐξέτασιν ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκπληγίς. From hence the Verb Θάμβειν, in termination active, in signification passive, perculsum esse, in Homer, Θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχαιεύς -- where it is the observation of Eustathius, Τὸ ἐθάμβησεν ἐνεργητικὸν ἢ νεώτερον χρόνος ἐκείνου. Θάμβόμενοι γὰρ, καὶ ἐθάμβηθη, καὶ τεθάμβημαι φασὶν οἱ μὲν Ὅμηρον: but not universally true. For (as to our purpose) we have both the use and sense of this word in the Old Testament As 1. Sam. 14. 15. Ὑψήθη ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἐθάμβησεν ἡ γῆ, and the earth quaked. And Psal. 47. 5. Ὑψήθη, Aquila, ἐθάμβησεν, Symmachus, ἐξεπλάγησεν: as Psal. 31. 22. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἦπα ὅτι τῇ ἐκστάσει μου, Aquila, θαμβήσῃ, Symmachus, ἐκπληξεί. The like is also in the passive termination: as Daniel expresses his fear in a Vision ἐθαμβήθη, καὶ πίπῃ ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου Dan. 8. 17. and the wicked are described by the wise man θαμβόμενοι δεινῶς, καὶ ἐν δαλμασιν ἐκπεσασόμενοι, Sap. 17. 3. From whence it appeareth that θαμβήσας of it self signifieth a high degree of fear, horror, and amazement. Gloss. Vet. Θαμβέμαι, Obstupeo, stupeo, paveco. And by the addition of the preposition ἐξ the signification is augmented, Ἐκθαμβέω, ἑκπληκτός. Hesychius passively; Ονειρόν ποτεσθὲν καὶ ἐκθαμβέω, Dan. 7. 7. actively, i.e. ἐκπληκτικόν. Such an augmentation in this word is justifiable by that rule left us in Eustathius ad Iliad. α'. ἡ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἐκείνου τὴν ἐξέτασιν ἔχον, ἀλλὰ ὁ ἴσως πολλὰς σημαίνει. Of which he gives an example in ἐκνομίαι, used by Aristophanes in Pluto, though not nam'd by him. And again, ad Iliad. γ'. ἡ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἐκείνου ἐκείνου, ὅποιον καὶ τὸ μέγιστον. Ἐκθαμβήσας therefore is μέγιστον θαμβήσας, to be surprized with horror in the highest degree, even unto stupefaction. Gloss. Vet. Ἐκθαμβέμαι, obstupefeco. The third word is Ἀδύμωνος. Vulg. Lat. Tædere in S. Mark, nectus esse in S. Matthew: but it hath yet a further sense. Ἀδύμωνος, ἀκνηδὺς, ἀγωνίῳ, says Hesychius. Ἀδύμωνος, τὸ λυπῆμα, Suidas. It signifieth therefore grief and anguish in excess, as appeareth also by the origination of it. For, as Eustathius observes, τὴν ἀδύμωνον προτέτυπον ἀδύμων ἀδύμωνος ὁ ἐκ λύπης ὡς οἶκ καὶ τινος κόρον, ὅς αὐτὸς λέγεται.

ἀναπνεύσας. Iliad. λ'. From ἀδῶ ἀδύσω ἀδύμων, from ἀδύμων ἀδύμων. It has therefore in it the signification of ἀδύ or λῖαν, *fatire* or *extremity*. From whence it is ordinarily so expounded, as if it contained the consequence of the greatest *grief* or *sorrow*, that is *anxiety of mind*, *disquietude* and *restlessness*. Ἀδύμων, ἀλῶν καὶ ἀπορίων, ἀμυχναίων, Etymol. As Anthony is express'd by Plutarch, after the loss of 8000. men, being in want of all things necessary for the rest, Κλεοπάτραν περιέμεινε, καὶ βεβρωμένης ἀδύμων ἦλυε. So where the Heb. עָוֶן is by the LXX. translated ἐκπλῶγῆς, by Symmachus it is rendered ἀδύμωνῆς, Eccl. 7. 17.

nal expression. Which render him suddenly, upon a present and immediate apprehension, possessed with fear, horror, and amazement; encompassed with grief, and overwhelmed with sorrow, press'd down with consternation and dejection of mind, tormented with anxiety and disquietude of spirit.

This he first express'd to his Disciples, saying, *My soul is exceeding sorrowfull*: and lest they should not fully apprehend the excess, adding, *even unto death*; as if the pangs of death had already encompass'd him, and, as the Psalmist speaks, the pains of hell had got hold upon him. He went but a little further before he express'd the same to his Father, falling on his face and praying, even with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death. Nor were his cries or tears sufficient evidences of his inward sufferings, nor could the sorrows of his breast be poured forth either at his lips or eyes; the innumerable pores of all his body must give a passage to more lively representations of the bitter anguish of his soul: and therefore while he prayed more earnestly, in that agony his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. As the Psalmist had before declar'd; *I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint. My heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels.* The heart of our Saviour was as it were melted with fear and astonishment, and all the parts of his body at the same time inflam'd with anguish and agony: well then might that melting produce a sweat, Psal. 22. 14.

and that inflam'd and rarified bloud force a passage through the numerous pores.

And as the Evangelists expressions, so the Occasion of the grief will manifest the height and bitterness thereof. For God layd on his own Son the iniquities of us all; and as we are obliged to be sorry for our particular sinnes, so was he grieved for the sinnes of us all. If then we consider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge, he understood all the sinnes of men for which he suffer'd, all the the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the majesty and ingratitude against the goodnesse of God, which was contain'd in all those sinnes. If we look upon his absolute conformity to the will of God, he was inflamed with most ardent love, he was most zealous of his glory, and most studious to preserve that right which was so highly violated by those sinnes. If we look upon his relation to the sons of men, he lov'd them all far more then they did themselves, he knew those sinnes were of themselves sufficient to bring eternall destruction on their soules and bodies, he considered them whom he so much loved, as lying under the wrath of God whom he so truly worshipped. If we reflect upon those graces which were without measure diffused through his soul, and caused him with the greatest habituell detestation to abhor all sin: If we consider all these circumstances, we cannot wonder at that grief and sorrow. For if the true contrition of one single sinner, bleeding under the sting of the law onely for his own iniquities, all which notwithstanding he knoweth not, cannot be performed without great bitterness of sorrow and remorse; what bounds can we set unto that grief, what measures to that anguish, which proceedeth from a full apprehension of all the transgressions of so many millions of sinners?

Adde unto all these present apprehensions, the immediate hand of God pressing upon him all this load, laying on his shoulders at once an heap of all the sorrows which
can

can happen unto any of the Saints of God ; that he being *touch'd with the feeling of our infirmities*, might become *mercifull High-priest*, able and willing to *succour them that are tempted*. Thus may we behold & see if there be any sorrow like unto that sorrow, which was done unto him ; *wherewith the Lord afflicted him in the day of his fierce anger*. And from hence we may and must conclude, that the Saviour of man, as he took the whole nature of man, so he suffered in whatsoer'e he took ; in his body, by internall infirmities and externall injuries, in his soul, by fears and sorrows, by unknown and inexpressible anguishes. Which shewes us fully, (if it can be shewn) the third Particular propounded, What our Saviour suffered.

Heb. 2. 17, 18.

4. 15.

Lam. 1. 12.

That our Saviour did thus *suffer*, is most necessary to believe. First, that thereby we may be assured of the verity of his humane nature. For if he were not man, then could not man be redeemed by him ; and if that nature in which he appeared were not truely humane, then could he not be truely man. But we may be well assured that he took on him our nature, when we see him subject unto our infirmities. We know the Godhead is of infinite perfection, and therefore is exalted far above all possibility of molestation. When therefore we see our Saviour truely suffer, we know his Divine essence suffered not, and thence acknowledge the addition of his humane nature, as the proper subject of his passion. And from hence we may infallibly conclude, Surely that Mediator between God and man was truely man, as we are men, who when he fasted was an hungry, when he travelled was thirsty and weary as we are, who being grieved wept, being in an agony sweat, being scourged bled, and being crucified dyed.

Secondly, it was necessary Christ should suffer for the Redemption of lapsed man, and their reconciliation unto God, which was not otherwise to be performed then by a plenary satisfaction to his will. He therefore was

by all his sufferings made an expiation, atonement, and propitiation for all our sinnes. For Salvation is impossible unto sinners, without remission of sin: and remission in the decree of God is impossible, without effusion of blood. Our Redemption therefore could not be wrought but by the blood of the Redeemer, but by a lamb slain, but by a suffering Saviour.

Thirdly, it behoved Christ to suffer, that he might purchase thereby eternall happinesse in the heavens both for himself the Head, and for the members of his body. *He drunk of the brook in the way, therefore hath he left up his head. Ought not Christ to suffer, and so to enter into his own glory?* And doth he not by the same right by which he entred into it, conferre that glory upon us? The recompence of the reward was set before him, and through an intuition of it he chearfully underwent whatsoever was layd upon him. He must therefore necessarily suffer to obtain that happinesse, who is therefore happy because he suffered.

Fourthly, it was necessary Christ should suffer, that we might be assured that he is truely affected with a most tender compalsion of our afflictions. For this end was he subjected to misery, that he might become prone unto mercy. For this purpose was he made a Sacrifice, that he might be a compalsionate High-priest: and therefore was he most unmercifull to himself, that he might be most mercifull unto us.

Fifthly, it was necessary the Son of man should suffer, thereby to shew us that we are to suffer, and to teach us how we are to suffer. For if these things were done to the greentree, what shall be done to the dry? Nay, if God spared not his naturall, his eternall, his onely-begotten Son, how shall he spare his adopted sons, who are best known to be children because they are chastiz'd, and appear to be in his paternall affection because they lye under his fatherly correction? We are therefore heirs onely
because

because coheirs with Christ; and we shall be kings onely because we shall reign together with him. It is a certain and infallible consequence, *If Christ be risen, then shall we also rise*; and we must look for as strong a coherence in this other, *If Christ hath suffered, then must we expect to suffer*. And as he taught the necessity of, so he left us the Direction in our sufferings. Great was the example of *Job*, but far short of absolute perfection: the pattern beyond all exception is alone our Saviour, who hath taught us in all our afflictions the exercise of admirable humility, perfect patience, and absolute submission unto the will of God.

And now we may perceive the full importance of this part of the Article, and every Christian may thereby understand what he is to believe, and what he is conceived to professe when he makes this confession of his faith, *He suffered*. For hereby every one is obliged to intend thus much: I am really perswaded within my self, and do make a sincere profession of this as a most necessary, certain, and infallible truth, That the Onely-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father, and of the same essence with the Father, did for the redemption of mankind really and truly suffer; not in his Divinity, which was impassible, but in his humanity, which in the dayes of his humiliation was subject unto our infirmities: That as he is a perfect Redeemer of the whole man, so he was a complete sufferer in the whole; in his body, by such dolorous infirmities as arise internally from humane frailties, and by such pains as are inflicted by externall injuries; in his soul, by fearfull apprehensions, by unknown sorrows, by anguish unexpressible. And in this latitude and propriety I believe our Saviour suffered.

U N D E R

UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.

AFTER the substance of this part of the Article consisting in our Saviours passion, *He suffered*, followeth the circumstance of time, declared by the present Governour, *under Pontius Pilate*. Which though the name of a stranger to the Common-wealth of Israel and the Church of Christ, is well preserved to eternall memory in the sacred Articles of our Creed. For as the Son of God by his determinate counsell was sent into the world to dye in the fulnesse of time: so it concerns the Church to be assured of the time in which he dyed. And because the ancient custome of the world was to make their computations by their Governours, and referre their historicall relations to the respective times of their government; therefore, that we might be properly assured of the Actions of our Saviour which he did, and of his sufferings, (that is, the Actions which others did to him) the present Governour is nam'd in that form of speech which is proper to such historicall or Chronologicall narrations, when we affirm that he suffered † *under Pontius Pilate*.

+ Ἐπὶ Πον-
τίου Πιλάτου.
Which words

are capable of a double construction. First, as they are used by S. Paul, 1. Tim. 6. 13. Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρήσαντος ὅτι Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, Who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that is, standing before him as before a Judge. As of the same Person, Mat. 28. 14. Καὶ ἐὰν ἀκούῃς τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμῶνος, If this come to be tried before the Procurator. Thus Festus pronounced it to S. Paul, Acts 25. 9. θέλεις κεινέσθαι ἐπ' ἐμῶ; and S. Paul answered in the same propriety of speech, ἐπὶ τῷ βήματι καίσαρος ἐσὼς εἰμι. Thus Christ tells his Apostles Mar. 13. 9. ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σαθήσιντε. And in this sense ἐπὶ is often used by the Greeks. Secondly, ἐπὶ Πιλάτου is under Pilate, that is, in the time of his Government, when and while he was Procurator of Judaea; as ἐπ' Ἀρχιερέων Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα, Luc. 3. 2. and ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, Mar. 1. 26. which is also according to the custome and language of the Greeks; As Κατακλινομένης ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἡ γένεσις, Marm. Arundel. And ἐπὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ, in this Kings reign, is the common phrase of Pausanias. Thus the Athenians among their 9 Ἀρχόντες had one who was call'd Ἐπώνυμος, because his name was used for the denotation of that year, and the phrase was usually ἐπὶ τοῦ δαίμονος, or ἐπὶ τοῦ δαίμονος.

ὡς δὲ τὰ ἀρχαῖα. As I find it thrice together in one place. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Ἰουδαῖος) τοὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, Πλάτων δ' ἐπὶ Ἀμφίβιου γέγονεν, ἐφ' ᾧ Περικλῆς ἐτελεύτησεν. Laert. in Platone In the same manner did the Lacedemonians make their historical accounts by their Ephori, and the Arg'vi by the Priestesses of Iuno. Ἐπὶ Χρυσιδῶν ἄρχειν τὰ πονηρότατα δοῖν δέοντα ἐπὶ ἱερωμένων, καὶ Αἰνισίου ἐφ' ᾧ Σπάρτη, καὶ Πυθοδώρου ἐπὶ δύο μῆνας ἀρχόντων Ἀθηναίοις. Thucyd. l. 2. And as the Greeks thus refer'd all actions to the times of these Governours, so did the Jews under the Roman Government to the Procurators of Judaea; as appears by Josephus, who mentionin: the first of that Office, Coponius, presently relates the insurrection of Judas Galileus in this manner: Ἐπὶ τῷ (Κωπονίῳ) τῷ ἀρχηγὰρ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Ἰούδας ὄνομα, οἷς ἀποστασὶν ἐποίησε τὸν ὀρθότατον. De. Bel. lud. l. 2. c. 12. then names his Successour Ambivius, ἐφ' ᾧ Σαλώμων Ἰαμνιῶν κατέλαβεν. after him Rufus, ἐφ' ᾧ δὴ καὶ τελευτᾷ Καῖσαρ. Antiq. lud. l. 18. c. 3. And in the same manner in the Creed, παθόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ, our Saviour suffered under Pontius Pilate, that is, at the time when he was Procurator of Judaea.

And because he not onely suffered under him as the present Governour, but also was arraigned and condemned by him as a Iudge; therefore it will be necessary for the illustration of the manner, and confirmation of the truth of our Saviour's sufferings, to declare what hath bin left and derived to our knowledge both concerning his Person and his Office.

For the first, we find him described by two names; nor is any other name of his extant, although, according to the † generall custome of the Romans, he should have three. The first of these two is * Pontius, the name descended to him from the originall of his family, which was very ancient; the second Pilatus, as a cognominall addition distinguishing from the rest descending from the same Originall.

† Pausanias speaking of the Romans, τρεῖς ὁπότοι ἢ ὀλίγισα καὶ ἐπὶ πλεονα ὀνόματα ἐκείνοι τίθενται. And

although Diomedes and Plutarch have observed, that even among the Romans there were some διώνυμα, yet the Prænomen was never omitted, as Priscian affirms. Ex illo tempore consuetudo tenuit, ut nemo Romanus sit absque prænomine. lib. 2.

* Pontius and Pilatus were his Nomen and Cognomen, in the same manner as Julius and Cæsar are describ'd by Suetonius: Non Cæsar & Bibulo, sed Iulio & Cæsarē Coss. actum scriberent, his eundem præponentes, nomine atque cognomine. l. 1. c. 20. Thus without a Prænomen or Cognomen he is exactly known to us by his Nomen properly call'd, and his Cognomen. The nature of

which two is thus describ'd by the Ancients : Nomen proprium est gentilitium, id est, quod originem gentis vel familie declarat, ut Portius, Cornelius; Cognomen est, quod uniuscuiusque proprium, & nominibus gentilitiis subjungitur, ut Cato, Scipio. *Diomedes de Oratore* l. 1. Nomen, quod familie originem declarat, ut Cornelius; Cognomen, quod nomini subjungitur, ut Scipio. (*basim* l. 2. The first of these Dionysius calls τὸ (συ)γενικὸν καὶ πατρωνυμικόν, Plurarch, εἰκίας ἢ ῥῶς κοινόν, & κοινόν ἀπὸ συγγενείας : the second he calls πατρωνυμικόν καὶ ἐπὶθέτω. Thus Pontius was his Nomen gentis or gentilitium, and Pilatus his Cognomen. As therefore Pontius Aquila, Pontius Cominius, Pontius Herennius, Pontius Paulinus, &c. so also Pontius Pilatus. wherefore in vain have some of the Ancients endeavoured to give an Etymology of these names, as they do of Greek and Hebrew names in the Scripture, and think thereby to express the nature or actions of them that have the names. As Isidorus Hispal. *Orig.* l. 7. c. 10. Pontius, declinans concilium, utique Judæorum : accepta enim aqua lavit manus suas, dicens, innocens ego sum à sanguine hujus justii. And S. Jerome, Quod significat nomen Pilati, i. e. malleatoris, i. e. qui domat ferreas gentes, ad *Mat.* 15. Pilatus, os malleatoris, quia dum Christum ore suo & justificat & condemnat, more malleatoris utrinque ferit. *Isid. ib.* Pontius, declinans consilium; Pilatus, os malleatoris. S. Jer. de nom. Hebraicis, in *Luca.* & rursus in *Actis.* where he lets us understand that these Etymologies were made from the Hebrew language, and makes an exception, because the letter P is here taken for the Hebrew Q, to which the Latine F more properly answers. Sed sciendum est quod apud Hebræos P litera non habetur, nec ullum nomen est quod hoc elementum sonet : abusive igitur accipienda qualiter F literam scripta sint. Thus did they vainly strive to find an Hebrew Original, and that such an one as should represent the conditions of Pilate, when these two names are nothing else but the Roman Nomen and Cognomen of that Person.

† Τῆς Ἀρχαίας
ἐθιμαρτίας
μεταποσέσεως
εἰς ἐπαρχίας,
Joseph. de Bel.
Jud. l. 2. c. 13.
Τῆς Ἀρχαίας
χώρας ὑποπε-
λάγης προσεμ-
θείσης τῇ Σύ-
ρων, *id. Antiq.*
Jud. l. 17. c. 15.
Παῖν ἸΚυρή-
νιος οἰς πλὴν Ἰου-
δαίας προδίδ-
κην Συρίας με-
νομένην, *ibid.*
l. 18. c. 1.

He was by birth a Roman, by degree of the Equestrian order, sent by Tiberius the Emperour to be a Governour in Judea. For about threescore yeares before our Saviours birth the Jewes by Pompey the Great were made tributary to the Romans. And although during the life of Hyrcanus the High-priest, the reign of Herod, and his son Archelaus, the Roman State suffered the Jewes to be ruled by their own lawes and governours; yet when Archelaus was banish'd by Augustus, they received their Governours from the Roman Emperour, being made a part of the † Province of Syria belonging to his care. In the life of Augustus there was a Succession of three, Coponius, Ambivius, and Rufus. At the beginning of the reign of Tiberius they were governed by Valerius Gratus, and at his departure by Pontius Pilate. The

The Office which this *Pilate* bare was the Procurator-
ship of *Judea*, as is most evident, out of the History both
of the *Romans*, from whom he received his authority,
and of the *Jewes*, over whom he exercis'd his dominion.

† Tacitus speaking of the Christians, Author

dominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est. *Annal.* l. 15. And Tertullian, most skilfull of their laws and customs, speaks thus of our Saviour: postremo oblatum Pontio Pilato, Syriam tunc ex parte Romana procuranti. *Apologet.* cap. 21. Whom S. Cyprian follows: Hunc Magistrorum ... Pontio Pilato, qui tunc ex parte Romana Syriam procurabat, tradiderunt. *Adv. Demetr.* Thus also Josephus for the Jewes: Περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαίου ἐπιτροπῆς καὶ Τιβερίου Πιλάτου. *de Bel. Jud.* l. 2. c. 14. and Philo, Πιλάτου ἡν ἦν ὑπαρχὸν ἐπιτροπῆς ἀπὸ Διδυμίου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, de legat. ad Caium. And therefore those words of S. Luke, c. 3. 1. ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, were properly translated by the old Interpreter, procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam. Thus Lucius Dexter ad annum Christi 28. Pontius Pilatus procurator Judææ à Tiberio mittitur in Judæam. And Justin Martyr most properly, τὸν καιρὸν δύνανται ἐπὶ Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ, τὸν ἡγομένῳ ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χερσὶν Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτροπῆς, *Apolog.* 2. And again speaking to the Emperours, by whom the procurators were sent, καὶ Πιλάτῳ τῷ ὑμῶν παρ' Ἰουδαίῳ ἡγομένῳ ἐπιτροπῆς. As also Eusebius, Δωδεκάτη ἐνιαυτοῦ τῆς Τιβερίου βασιλείας ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς Ἰουδαίας ὑπὸ Τιβερίου καθίσταται Πιλάτος. *Hist.* l. 1. c. 10. And S. Jeromes translation of his *Chronicon*: Pilatus procurator Judææ à Tiberio mittitur. Thus it appears that Pilate of the Equestrian Order was properly Procurator, as that Office was ordinarily given to men of that Order, as Tacitus testifies: Cn. Julius Agricola utrumq; eorum procuratorem Caesarum habuit, quæ equestris nobilitas est. *In vita Jul. Agric.* which is to be understood concerning the Imperiall Provinces: for into those which were of the Provinces of the People, the Procurators sent by Cæsar were of the Liberrati. For the Emperour sent into all the Provinces his Procurators, but with this difference, as Dio observes, οἱς πάντα ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη τὰ τε ἰαυτῶ καὶ τὰ τῶ δῆμου καὶ μὴν ἐν ἡσὶ ἐπὶ πίων, καὶ ὅ ἐν ἡσὶ ἀπελευθέρων, πῦμπι. *Hist.* l. 53.

But what was the Office of a † Procurator in those times, though necessary for our present purpose, is not so easie to determine, because it was but newly introduced into the Roman Government. For before the Dominion of that City was changed from a Commonwealth into an Empire, there was no such publick Office in any of the Provinces,

† The Roman Procurator is ordinarily in Greek Authors expressed by their ἐπιτροπῆς. as the Glossa Latino-Græc. and Procurator,

ἐπιτροπῆς. But yet they are not of the same latitude in their use; ἐπιτροπῆς comprehending the notion of Tutor, as well as Procurator. Hesyc. ἐπιτροπῆς ὁ πρεσβυτέρως

καὶ ἡγεμόνων, καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐξουσίας, καὶ ὁρῶντων. Gloss. Vet. Ἐπίτροπος, Procurator, tutor. Ἐπίτροπος therefore was used by the Greeks in both notions, where of Procurator of the Latines is but one. And in the language of the Romans, he is a Procurator, which undertakes to manage the businesse of another man. Procurator si negotium suscipit, saith Alconius in *Divina*. and Sex. Pompeius, Procurator absentis nomine actor fit; he to whom the care of another mans estate or affairs was committed. Gloss. Vet. Ἐντολὴ, Commissum, and Ἐντολεύς, Procurator. In correspondence to these Procurators of the affairs and estates of private Persons, there were made such as did take care in every Province of the Imperiall revenue: who in respect of the Person whom they served, were called Procuratores Cæsaris, or Augustales; in respect of the Countreys where they served, were termed Procuratores provinciales. Their office is best described by Dion Hist. l. 53. Τὰς ἐπιτροπὰς, ἕτοιμα ὅτι τὰ κοινὰ προσόδους ἀλλέγοντας καὶ περὶ ταῦτα σφίσι ἀναλίσκοντας ὀνομάζονται. We call, saies he, those ἐπιτροπὰς, that is procuratores, which receive the publick revenues, and dispose of them according to the commands received from the Emperour. For they acted in his name, and what was done by them was accounted as done by the Emperour himself. Quæ acta gesta sunt à Procuratore Cæsaris, sic ab eo comprobantur, ac si à Cæsare gesta essent, *Ulpian. l. 1. ff.* As we read in Tacitus of the Emperour Claudius, cæpius audita vox Principis, parem vim rerum habendam à Procuratoribus suis judicatarum, ac si ipse statuisset, *Annal. l. 12.* and in Suetonius, Ut rata essent quæ Procuratores sui in iudicando statuerent, à Senatu prætoris egit. The proper Office therefore of the Provinciall Procurator was, to receive the Imperiall revenue, and dispose of it as the Emperour commanded, and to all intents and purposes to do such things as were necessary thereunto, with such authority, as if the Emperour himself had done them.

and particularly in *Judæa* none till after the banishment of *Archelaus*, some yeares after our Saviours birth. When *Augustus* divided the Provinces of the Empire into two parts, one of which he kept for his own care, and left the other to the inspection of the Senate, he sent together with the President of each Province, as the Governour in chief of the Province, a Procurator, whose office was, to take an account of all the tribute, and whatsoever else was due to the Emperour, and to order and dispose of the same for his advantage. Neither was there at the first institution of this office any other act belonging properly to their Jurisdiction, but such a care & disposal of the Imperiall Revenue: which they exercis'd as inferiour and subordinate to the President, alwayes supreme Provinciall Officer.

Now

Now *Judaea* being made a part of the Province of *Syria*, and consequently under the care of the President of that Province, a particular Procurator was assigned unto it for the disposing of the Emperours revenue. And because the Nation of the *Jews* were alwayes suspected of a rebellious disposition against the *Roman* state, and the President of *Syria*, who had the power of the sword, was forc'd to attend upon the other parts of his Province; therefore the Procurator of *Judaea* was furnished with † power of life and death, and to administred all the power of the President, which was, as to the *Jews*, supreme. Which is very observable, as an eminent act of the Providence of God, by which the full power of Judicature in *Judaea* was left in the hands of the Resident Procurator.

† This appeareth by Coponius, the first proper Procurator of *Judaea*, who was brought in by Quirinus *Præses* of *Syria*,

For

when he came to dispose of the goods of Archelaus, and to reduce *Judaea* into the form of a Province, and to joyn it to *Syria*. Of this Coponius Josephus writeth after this manner: Κωπώνιος το αὐτοῦ (Κυρλίω) (ὡς) καταπέμπεται τὰ γματὰ τῶν ἱππέων, ἡγεσόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πάντι ἐξουσίᾳ: That being of the Equestrian order, he was sent with Quirinus to govern the *Jews* with the supreme power. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. And yet more expressly as to the time, occasion, and extent of his power: Τῆς δ' Ἀρχελαῦ χάρις εἰς ἱπαρχίαν ἀφ' ἡρακλείδου, ἐπίτροπος τις ἱππέων, ὃς Ῥωμαίοις τὰς ἐξουσίας, Κωπώνιος, πέμπεται, μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβόν τὴν Καίσαρος ἑξουσίαν, Id. de Bel. Jud. l. 2. c. 11. when those parts which were under the command of Archelaus were reduced into a Province, Coponius was sent thither by the Emperour, and furnished with power of life and death. For although in the Proconsular Provinces the Procurator of the Emperour had no power but in those things which belonged to the Exchequer; yet in those Provinces which were properly *Præsidiales* the Procurator was *offen loco Præsidis*. From whence in the Ancient Inscriptions we read of the same person, Procurator & *Præses* Alpium, Procurator & *Præses* provinciarum per Orientem, Procurator & *Præses* provinciae Sardiniae. It was often therefore so that the Procurator did *Præsidis partibus fungi*: as Ulpian l. 8. De officio Proconsulis, In provinciam enim *Præsidium* provinciarum, nec aliter Procuratori Cæsaris hæc cognitio injungitur, quam *Præsidis* partibus in provincia fungatur. And this is very necessary to be observed, because a Procurator barely such, not armed with the power of the *Præses* provinciae, had not the power of the sword. As Antoninus to Valerius; Procurator meus, qui vice *præsidis* non fungebatur, exili tibi pœnam non potuit irrogare, l. 9. Cod. de panis: and to Heliodorus; Procurator meus, qui vice *præsidis* provinciae non fungitur, sicut exigere pœnam desertæ accusationis non potest, ita judicare ut ea inferatur sententia sua non potest, l. 3. C. Ubi causæ. This was plain in the case of Lucilius Capito Procurator

of Asia minor, who was call'd in question for exceeding his power, & defend therein by Tiberius. Procurator Asiæ Lucilius Capito, accusante provincia, causam dixit magna cum adseveratione Principis, non se jus nisi in servitia & pecunias familiares dedisse. Quod si vim Prætoris usurpasset, manibusque militum usus foret, spreta in eo mandata sua, audirent socios. Tacit. Annal. And Dio upon the said example observes in generall, that the Procurators had no such power. Οὐ γὰρ ἔξῃν τὸ τοιαῦτα τὰ αὐτοκρατορικὰ χρεῖματα διοικοῦσι πλεον ἐδῆν ποιεῖν, ἢ τὰς νομομισθίας προσόδους ἐκλέγειν, καὶ περὶ τῶν διαφορῶν ἐν τῇ αἰσχροῦ καὶ χρεῖ τοῦ νόμου ἐξουτοῖς ἰδιώταις διακρίνασθαι. But although the ordinary Procurators had no other power but to dispose of the revenue, and determine private causes; yet he which was vice Præsidis had the power of the Præses; and such a Procurator was Pontius Pilate in Judæa, as the others who preceded him also were.

Mar. 14. 64.

Joh. 18. 30.

31.

† I say therefore the Jews answered that it was not lawfull for them to

put any man to death, because that power was taken out of their hands. For although S. Augustine think they thought it not lawfull in respect of the Pascheover, Intelligendum est eos dixisse, non sibi licere interficere quenquam, propter diei festi sanctitatem, quem celebrare jam cœperant, Tract. 14. in Joann. and S. Cyril be of the same opinion: yet others of the Ancients deliver the true cause why they applied themselves to Pilate to be their want of power; as Ammonius most expressly, Τίνας ἄν

καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκ ἀπολλοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν Πιλάτου ἡγούρου; μάλιστα μὲν τὸ πάλαι

ἀρχῆς αὐτῆς ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὑπετίμωντο, λοιπὸν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους τῶν πραγμάτων κει-
 μένων: and upon those words in S. John, ὧς ἐκπεσόντες τῇ ἀρχῇ, ἡ ὁρμή ὑπὸ
 Ῥωμαίους, ἢ πονεῖτο. So Theophylact, Ἀρρυσιν αὐτὰν εἰς τὸ κρατῆριον, καὶ οὐκ
 εἰς αὐτοὶ ἐξουσίαν ἀνελεῖν, αὐτὸς τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις κειμένων: and
 before him S. Chryl.

was not lawfull: not in respect of the law of *Moses*, which gave them both sufficient power, and absolute command to punish divers offenders with death; but in relation to the *Roman* Empire, which had taken all that dominion from them. Fourty years before the destruction of *Jerusalem* the *Jews* themselves acknowledge that they lost their power; which is sufficient to shew that they had it not when our Saviour suffer'd; and it is as true that they lost it twenty years before, at the relegation of *Arche-laus*, and the coming of *Coponius* the Procurator with full power of life and death. Wherefore our Saviour was delivered unto *Pilate* as the supreme Judge over the nation of the *Jews*, that he might pronounce the sentence of death upon him.

But how this Judge could be perswaded to an act of so much injustice and impiety, is not yet easie to be seen, The numerous controversies of the religion of the *Jews* did not concern the *Roman* Governours, nor were they moved with the frequent quarrells arising from the different sects. *Pilate* knew well it was for envy that the chief Priests delivered him; and when he had examin'd him, he found no fault touching those things whereof they accused him. Three times did he challenge the whole nation of the *Jews*, why, what evil hath he done? three times did he make that clear profession, *I have found no cause of death in him.* His own wife, admonished in a dream, sent unto him, saying, *Have thou nothing to do with that just man*: and when he heard that he made himself the son of God, he was more afraid: and yet notwithstanding these apprehensions and professions, he condemn'd and crucified him.

Here we must look upon the nature and disposition of
Pilate

Mat. 27. 18.

Luc. 23. 14.
22.

Mat. 27. 19.

Joh. 19. 7, 8.

† So Philo te-
stifieth of him:
ὁ γὰρ τῶν οὐσιν
ἀκαμπτὸς, καὶ
μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ
δύσε ἀμείλι-
κτος. de Le-
gat. ad Caium.
And again,
Ὅτι αὐτῷ ἐγκό-
πως ἔχων καὶ
βαρύμυτος ἀν-
δρῶν.

Luc. 23. 1.

Mar. 15. 15.

* For that
which is obser-
ved by Philo
upon the dedi-
cation of the

Shields at the first entrance into his Government, must needs be much more true at this time of our Saviour's Passion, when he had committed so many more insolencies, viz. that he feared the Jews should complain of him to Tiberius. Τὸ πλεονεκτήμα τῶν οὐκ ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῶν ἐξέτελέχον, καταδίδωμι μὴ τῶν ὄντων προσηβασίμων καὶ πλεονεκτημάτων αὐτῶν ἐπιτιμῶν ἐξολέγῃσι τὰς δωρεοδικίας, τὰς ὑβρίδας, τὰς ἀρπαγὰς, τὰς ἀκτίας, τὰς ἐμπροίας, τὸ ἀκείτως καὶ ἐπιδόμους ὄντας, τὴν ἀνέναντον καὶ ἀγλαῶτα τὴν ὁμότητα διεξελθόντες. de Legat. ad Caium.

Pilate, which inclined and betray'd him to so foule an Act. He was a man of an † high, rough, untractable, and irreconcilable spirit; as he is describ'd by the *Jews*, and appeareth from the beginning of his government; when he brought the Bucklers stamp with the pictures of *Cæsar* into *Jerusalem*, (which was an abomination to the *Jews*), and could neither be moved by the blood of many, nor persuaded by the most humble applications and submissive intreaties of the whole Nation, to remove them, till he received a sharp reprehension and severe command from the Emperour *Tiberius*. After that he set on the *Corban*, that sacred treasury, and spent it upon an *Aquæduct*: nor could all their religious and importunate petitions divert his intentions; but his resolution went through their blood to bring in water. When the *Galilaans* came up to *Jerusalem* to worship God at his own temple, he mingled their blood with their sacrifices. Adde to this untractable and irreconcilable spirit, by which he had so often exasperated the *Jews*, an avaritious and rapacious disposition, which prompted him as much to please them; and we may easily perceive what mov'd him to condemn that person to death whom he declared innocent. The Evangelist telleth us that *Pilate*, willing to content the people, released *Barabbas* unto them, and deliver'd *Jesus* to be crucified. They accused him at *Rome* for all the * insolencies and rapines which he had committed, and by this Act he thought to pacify them.

It was thus necessary to expresse the Person under whom

whom our Saviour suffered, First, that we might for ever be assured of the † time in which he suffered. The enemies of Christianity began first to unsettle the time of his Passion, that thereby they might at last deny the Passion itself; and the rest of their falsehood was detected by the † discovery of their false Chronology. Some fixed it to the † seventh year of the reign of Tiberius; whereas it

† Cautissime qui Symbolum tradiderunt, etiam tempus, quo hæc sub Pontio Pilato gesta sunt, designarunt, ne

in aliqua parte velut vaga & incerta gestorum traditio vacillaret. *Ruffin* in Exp. Symb. Credimus itaque in eum qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est & sepultus. Addendum enim erat iudicium nomen propter temporum cognitionem. *S. Aug.* de Fide & Symb. Pilatus Iudex erat in illo tempore ab Imperatore positus in Iudæa, sub quo Dominus passus est, cujus mentio ad temporis significationem, non ad personæ illius pertinet dignitatem. *Serm.* 131. de Tempore.

translated some of those which liv'd not long before him. Οὐκ ἔν σαφὲς ἀπαλῶς καὶ τὸ πλάσμα τῆς χτ' ἡ ζωτῆρ ἡμῶν ὁ πομνήματα χθις ἀπὸ τῶν διαδεδωκότων, ἐν οἷς αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς παροσημοῦσας χθις ἡ πεπληκόντων ἀπαλῶς καὶ τῆς ζωτῆρ. *Hist. Eccles.* l. 1. c. 9.

“Επὶ τῆς τετάρτης δ' οὐμὴ κατὰ τὴν Τετάρτην, ἢ ἄλλαν ἔτις ἐβόμει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῆς, τὰ πρὸς τὸ σπτή-
ροι αὐτῆς αὐτῶν τὰ μνηστῆντα αὐτῶν χθις ὅν δ' αὖτις χθις μὴδ' ὅπως πο-
τὶ Ἰουδα Πιλάτῳ. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* l. 1. c. 10.

A certain Pontius Pilate was not then Procurator in Ju-
dea, and as certain that our Saviour was baptized eight
years after, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius
Cesar. Some of the Jews, lest the destruction of Jeru-
salem might seem to follow upon and for our Saviour's
crucifixion, have remov'd it near threescore years more
backward yet, † placing his death in the beginning of
Herod's reign, who was not born till toward the death of

Luc. 3. 1.

† Divers of the Jews place the Passion of the Christ in the

year of their account 3724. which is 69 years before our common account of the year in which he truly suffer'd. This Invention of their own, grounded upon no foundation, and back'd with not so much as the least probability, they deliver as a Tradition among them, continued in this Rhythm

בשנת ג' מלכות חשון הוציאו נלך
ובשנת קכ"ז ב' נצח

i.e. In the year 3724. he of Nazareth was taken,

And in the year 532. he was crucified on a tree.

Not that they thought him taken in one year, and crucified in another; but those two

unequall numbers signify the same year, the lesser number being a Period of years, which seven times numbred equalleth the greater. So that their meaning is, that after 3. periods consisting of 532. years, in the year of the world 3724. Jesus of Nazareth was crucified.

the same King. Others have removed it further yet near
 twenty years; and so vainly tell us how he dyed under
Aristobulus, above fifty years before his birth in *Beth-
 lehem*. This doe they teach their Proselytes to this end,
 that they may not believe so much as the least historical
 part of the blessed Evangelists. As therefore they deny
 the time of our Saviour's passion, in designe to destroy his
 doctrine; so, that we might establish the substance of the
 Gospel depending on his death, it was necessary we should
 retaine a perfect remembrance of the time in which he
 dyed.

† Nota quod
in Pilato &
uxore ejus, ju-
stum Domi-
num confiten-
tibus, Gentilis
populi testi-
monium est.
S. Hieron. in
Mat. 27.

* That Pontius Pilate wrote unto Tiberius of the death and resurrection of our Saviour, is testified by Tertullian, who was best acquainted with the Roman History. Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, & ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianis, Cæsari tum Tiberio muniavit. A. 6log. c. 21. And again, Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in seculum introivit, annunciatum sibi ex Syria Palaestina, quæ veritatem illius (Christi) divinitatis revelaret, detulit ad Senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui, c. 5. This is related by Eusebius out of Tertullian in his Ecclesiastical History l. 2, c. 2. and referred to the two and twentieth year of Tiberius.

Tiberius in his Chron. Pilato de Christianorum dogmate ad Tiberium referente
Tiberius retulit ad Senatum, ut inter cetera sacra reciperetur. The authority of
this Expreſſe is grounded on the great reputation of Tertullian, (as is observed al-
ſo by the Author of the Chronicon Alexandrinum, who concludes the relation with
theſe words, *ὡς ἰσορεῖ Τερτυλλιάδης ὁ Ρωμαῖος*;) and the generall cuſtome by
which all the Governours of the provinces did give an account unto the Emperour of all
ſuch paſſages as were moſt remarkable: *παλαιὴ κληρονηκός τις ἔδωκε τοῖς τῶν ἰθὺν
ἀρχαῖς, ὡς ἰσορεῖ καὶ τοῖς μὲν τῶν τῆν βασιλείαν ἀρχὴν ἔπικρατῆν σημα-
νῶν, ὡς μὴ δὲν αὐτὸν διαδιδράκοι τῶν οὐδῶν.* Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 2. c. 2.

presented to the Senate; . secondly, by Records written . The Ancient
in tables of all things of moment which were acted in his Romans were
government. very desirous
to preserve the
memory of all

remarkable passages which happened in the City: and this was done either in their A-
cta Senatus, or Acta diurna populi; which were diligently made, and carefully kept
at Rome. In the same manner the Governours in the Provinces took care that all
things worthy of remark should be written in publick tables, and preserved as the
Acta their government. And agreeably to this custome Pontius Pilate kept the
Memories of the Jewish affairs, which were therefore called Acta Pilati, in which
an account was given of our blessed Saviour; and the Primitive Christians did ap-
peal unto them in their disputes with the Gentiles, as to a most undoubted testimony.
Justine Martyr urged them ev'n unto the Roman Emperours: *Καὶ τῶν τε ὅτι γέγονε,
διδάσκοντες μαθεῖν ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ ὑπομνήων Ἀκτῶν.* And again, *Ὅτι ὅ
τῶν τε ἐπὶ Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ ὑπομνήων Ἀκτῶν μαθεῖν διδάσκοντες.*
Apol. 2. And in the differences between the Christians, they were cited by both parties.
As the Tessalectarist alledged them for the custome of the observance of Easter,
as Epiphanius testifieth of them; *ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀκτῶν δὲ Πιλάτου ἀρχαῖς τὴν ἀνεί-
σθαι εὐαγγελίαν, ἐν οἷς ἐμνήσθη, τῇ περὶ ὁκτώ καλανδῶν Ἀπειλλίων τὸν Σωτῆρα
στεινάζειν.* And Epiphanius urgeth the same Acta against them, but according to
other copies: *Ἐτι ὅτι εὐαγγέλιον ἀπὸ Πιλάτου, ἐν οἷς σημειώθη, περὶ δεκα-
πέντε καλανδῶν Ἀπειλλίων τὸ πάθος γέγονε.* Hares. 50.

Thirdly, it behoved us to take notice of the Roman
Governour in the expression of our Saviours passion, that
thereby we might understand how it came to passe that
Christ should suffer according to the Scriptures. The Pro-
phets had foretold his death, but after such a manner as
was not to be performed by the Jews, according to whose
law and custome no man amongst them ever dyed.
Being then so great a Prophet could not dye but in Jerusa-

law, being the death he was to suffer was not agreeable to the lawes and customes of the *Jews*; it was necessary a *Roman* Governour should condemn him, that so the counsell of the will of God might be fulfilled, by the malice of the one, and the customes of the other.

And now the advantage of this Circumstance is discover'd, every one may expresse the importance of it in this manner. I am fully perswaded of this truth, as beyond all possibility of contradiction, that in the *fulnesse of time* God sent his Son, and that the eternall Son of God so sent by him did suffer for the sinnes of men, after the fiftieth year of *Tiberius* the *Roman* Emperour, and before his death, in the time of *Pontius Pilate* the *Cæsarean* Procurator of *Judæa*; who, to please the Nation of the *Jews*, did condemn him whom he pronounced innocent, and delivered him, according to the custome of that Empire, and in order to the fulfilling of the propheties, to dye a painfull and a shamefull death upon the Crosse. And thus I believe in Christ that *suffered under Pontius Pilate*.

W A S C R U C I F I E D.

FROM the generall consideration of our Saviours passion, we proceed to the most remarkable particular, his *Crucifixion*, standing between his Passion, which it concludeth, and his Death, which it introduceth. For the explication whereof it will be necessary, first, to prove that the promised *Messias* was to be crucified, that he which was designed to dye for our sinnes was to suffer upon the Crosse; secondly, to shew that our *Jesus*, whom we worship, was certainly and truly crucified, and did suffer, whatsoever was so foretold, upon the Crosse; thirdly, to discover what is the nature of crucifixion, what peculiarities of suffering are contain'd in dying on the Crosse.

That the *Messias* was to be crucified, appeareth both by

by Types which did apparently foreshew it; and by Prophecies which did plainly foretell it. For though all those representations and predictions which the forward & zeal of some ancient Fathers gathered out of the Law and the Prophets cannot be said to signify so much; yet in many Types was the crucifixion of Christ represented, and by some prophecies foretold. This was the true and unremovable stumbling-block to the Jews; nor could

† The ancient Fathers following the Steps of the Apostles, to prove all the particulars of our Saviours death out of the Old

Testament, have made use of those types and prophecies which did really and truly signify it; but together with them, partly out of their own conceptions, partly out of too much credit to the translations, have urged those places which the Jews may most easily evade, and we can produce but with small or no pretence. As for the extending of the hands of Moses, they conceive it to be a perfect Type, and Barnabas tells us, the Spirit commanded Moses that he should make the similitude of a Crosse; *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκαστὸν Μωσὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἵνα ποιῇ τὸ πᾶν σωτῆρ' καὶ τὸ μέλλοντος σωτῆρ'·* but the text assures us no more then that Moses bent up his hand, which might be without any similitude of a Cross; & when both were lifted up by Aaron and Hur, the representation is not certain. And yet after Barnabas, Justin tells us that Moses represented the Crosse; *τὰς χεῖρας ἐκάρτεως ἐκπέδων*: and Tertullian calls it habitum crucis. In the same manner with the strange Indian Statue, which is describ'd by Hardisanes, as *ἀνδρὶς ἐστὶς ὁρδὸς, ἔχων τὰς χεῖρας ὑπὸ πλάγους ἐν τῷ πᾶσι σωτῆρ'.* Porphyr. de Styge. With lesse probability did they gather both the name of Jesus, and the Crosse of Christ, from the 318. servants of Abraham. *Ἰσὺν δὲ καὶ Ἡτὰ δὲ καὶ τὸν τριακοσίους.* Epist. Barn. As if *ἡ* stood for Jesus, and *T* for the Crosse. And yet Clemens Alex. follows him: *Φασὶν οὖν εἶναι τὸ μὲν Κλειανὸν σημεῖον τῷ πᾶσι καὶ τὸ δὲ χημὰ τριακοσίους.* As also S. Ambrose, Nam & Abraham 318. duxit ad bellum, & ex innumeris tropha hostibus reportavit, signoque Dominice crucis & nominis, &c. Prol. ad l. 1. de Fide. and S. Augustine of another 300. Quorum numerus, quia trecentierant, signum insinuat Crucis, propter literam T Græcam, qua iste numerus significatur. and Clemens Alexandrinus again of the 300. *Ἐν δὲ οἱ τὸς τριακοσίους πῆχες σύμβολον τὸ Κλειανὸν σημεῖον λέγεται.* Strom. l. 6. As unlikely a Type did they make Jacob's Ladder. Ego puto crucem Salvatoris illam esse scalam quam Jacob vidit. Hieron. Scala usque ad cælum attingens crucis figurā habuit; Dominus innixus scalæ Christus crucifixus ostenditur. August. These and many others, by the writers of the succeeding ages, were produced out of the Old Testament, as Types of the Crosse, and may in some sense be applied to it being otherwise proved, but prove it not.

they ever be brought to confesse the *Messias* should

Ecc 3

† dye

† Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue with Iustine Martyr, when he had confessed many

of the Christian doctrine, would by no means be brought to this: *εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀτίμως ἡ τῶς σωρωθῆναι τὸν Χριστὸν*, subaud. *ἔδει*) ἀπορροῦν· ὁπκατὰ δευτὸς γὰρ ὁ σωρῆ-
μῶς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λέγει *ἔδει*· ὡς περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ διωπεισῶς ἔχω. *Ἀπὸ* afterwards
 granting his Passion, wrote him to prove his crucifixion; *ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐδὲ εἰς ἔννοιαν*
ἐλθεῖν διωδμεθα. So Tertullian describes the Jews, negantes passionem crucis in
 Christum prædicatam, & argumentantes insuper non esse credendum, ut ad id ge-
 nus mortis exposuerit Deus filium suum, quod ipse dixit, *Ma'edictus omnis homo*
qui pependit in ligno. Adv. *Judeos* c. 10.

† dye that death upon a tree to which the curse of the law belonged: and yet wee need no other Oracles, then such as were committed to those Jews, to prove that Christ was so to suffer.

A clearer type can scarce be conceived of the Saviour of the world, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blest'd, then *Isaac* was; nor can God the Father, who gave his onely-begotten Son, be better express'd then by that Patriarch in his readinesse to sacrifice his son, *his onely son Isaac, whom he loved*. Now when that grand act of obedience was to be perform'd, we find *Isaac* walking to the mountain of *Moriah* with the wood on his shoulders, and saying, *Here is the wood, but where is the sacrifice?* while in the command of God, and the intencion and resolution of *Abraham*, *Isaac* is the sacrifice who bears the wood. And the Christ, who was to be the most perfect sacrifice, the person in whom all nations were perfectly to be blest'd, could dye no other death in which the wood was to be carried; and being to dye upon the Crosse, was, by the for-
 * custome used in that kind of death, certainly to carry

* *Th's custome is very considerable as to be*

explication of this Type; and is to be therefore confirmed by the testimonies of the Ancients, which are most express. Βασίζοντινὰ ἑξὺ δαυμόνων χυθόνων κακὴν μὲν ἰδόντι σωρὸν αὐτῷ σημαίνε· τοῖσι γὰρ ὁ σωρὸς θανάτου, καὶ ὁ μέλλων περὶ αὐτῷ πρότερον αὐτὸν βασίζε. *Artemid.* l. 2. c. 41. Τῷ μὲν σώματι ἑξὺ κολαζόμενων ἑκάστος ἑξὺ κακῶρων ἐκφίει τὸν αὐτὸν σωρὸν. *Plutarch.* de his qui seculo puniuntur. So these not long after our Saviours death, and much before i. *Plautus* in *Carbonaric*; *Patibulum ferat per urbem, deinde affigatur cruci*.

† This

it. Therefore *Isaac* † bearing the wood, did prefigure
 Christ bearing the crosse. † This is not
 Christians, but the Jews themselves have refer'd this Type unto that custome. For
 only the obser-
 vation of the
 upon Gen. 22. 6. And Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering, and laid it up-
 on Isaac his son, the lesser *Bersith* hath this note: *כוחו שמונו* even
 as a man carries his crosse upon his shoulders.

When the fiery serpents bit the *Israelites*, and much
 people dyed, *Moses*, by the command of God, made a ser- Num. 21. 9.
 pent of brasse, and put it upon a pole; and it came to pass
 that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the
 serpent of brasse, he lived. Now if there were no expresse
 promise of the *Messias*, then the seed of the woman which
 should bruse the serpents head; if he were to perform
 that promise by the vertue of his death; if no death could
 be so perfectly represented by the hanging on the pole as
 that of crucifixion; then was that manifestly foretold which
 Christ himself informed *Nicodemus*, As *Moses* lifted up Joh. 3. 14.
 the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the son of man
 be lifted up.

† The common
 phrase by which
 that death was

expressed. In *crucem tolli*; *Paul. 1. 5. Sentent. Tit. 22, 23, & 25.* As in the Chal-
 dee *גומלין* by origination elevatio, by use is particularly crucifixio.

The Paschal lamb did plainly typify that lamb of God
 that taketh away the sinnes of the world; and the prepa-
 ring of it did not onely * represent the Crosse, but the com-
 mand or ordinance of the passeover did foretell as much.

* *Justine Mar-*
tyr shows how
the manner of
the roasting of

For

the Paschall lamb did represent the affixing of a man unto the crosse, and thereby was
 a type of Christ. *Τὸ καλευδὲν πρὸ βατον ἐκείνο ὅλον γίνεσθαι τῷ πάθει τῷ σωρῷ δι-*
επάχει, ἐμμελεν ὁ Χειρὸς σύμβολον ἦν, τὸ γὰρ ὁπῶς ἄνθρωπος πρὸ βατον, σμικατιζο-
μεν ὁμοίως τῷ σμικατι τῷ σωρῷ ὁπῶς. *Εἰς γὰρ ὁρδισ, ὁ βέλειςκος διαφρονῶν*
ἀπὸ τῆς κατωτάτης μερῆς μέχρι τῆς κεφαλῆς, ὡς καὶ πάλιν, καὶ τὸ μεταφρερον, ὡ
περὶ τῶν ὡς αἱ χεῖρες τῆς πρὸ βατον. Dial. cum Tryphone. To which *Arnoldus*
Camotensis alludeth. In veru crucis boni odoris assatio excoquat carnalium sensu-
 um cruditatem. De *Cœna Domini*, commonly attributed to *S. Cyprian*. Not is this
 roasting of the Lamb any far-fetcht figure of the Crosse: for since roasting hath bin
 the gbe

thought a proper resemblance of it: where the body of the thing roasted hath the shape of a lamb, there it beares the similitude of a proper Crosse, with an erect and transfused beam; where the roasted body is onely of length and uniform, as a fish, there the resemblance is of a freight and simple *σαυρός*. As it is represented by Hesychius. *Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.*

Exod. 12. 46. For while 'tis said; ye shall not break a bone thereof; it was thereby intimated, that the Saviour of the world should suffer that death to which the breaking of the bones belonged, (and that, according to the constant custome, it was the punishment of crucifixion;) but onely in that death should by the providence of God be so particularly preserv'd, as that not one bone of his should be touch'd. And thus the crucifixion of the *Messias* in severall Types was represented.

† Although indeed it must be confess'd, that the Crucifixion and the Crucifixion were two severall punishments, and that

they ordinarily made the Crosse a lingering death; yet because the Law of Moses did not suffer the body of a man to hang upon a tree in the night, therefore the Romans, so far as comply with the Jews, did break the bones of those whom they crucified in Judea constantly, whereas in other Countreys they did it but occasionally.

Nor was it onely thus prefigured and involved in the typicall resemblances, but also clearly spoken by the Prophets in their particular and expresse predictions. Nor shall we need the accession of any lost or additionall Prophetical expressions, which some of the Ancients have made use of: those which are still preserved even among the Jews, will yield this truth sufficient testimonies.

As Barnabas cites one of the Prophets whom we know not. *Ομοίως πάλιν ἐπὶ τῷ σαυρῷ ἀγίῳ ἐν αἵματι περὶ-*

τη λέγοντι, καὶ τότε λαῖμα (σωταὶ ἀδελφοί); καὶ λέγει Κύριος, Ὅταν εὐαγγέλιον ἀναγῶ, καὶ ὅταν ἐκ εὐαγγελίου αἷμα αἰσθῶ. which words are not to be found in any of the Prophets. Thus Justine Martyr, to prove ὅτι μετὰ τὸ σαυραδῆναι βασιλεὺς ὁ Χριστός, produceth a prophecy out of the 96. Psalm in these words; ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. And Tertullian, who advances all his conception; Agnoscite legisti penes prophetam in Psalmis, Dominus regnavit a ligno: expecto quid intelligas

illigas, ne forte lignarium aliquem regem significari puteris, & non Christum, quæ inde à passione Christi (lege crucis, for he himself hath it ligni, Adv. Marcion. l. 3. c. 19.) superata morte regnavit. Adv. Jud. c. 10. And in the place cited against Marcion: Etsi enim mors ab Adam regnavit usque ad Christum, cur Christus non regnasse dicatur à ligno, ex quo crucis ligno mortuus regnum mortis excludit? Thus they, and some after them, make use of those words, ἀπὸ ξύλου à ligno, which are not to be found either in the Greek or Latine Translation, from whence they seem to produce them; nor is there any thing like them in the Originall, or any Translation extant, nor the least mention or footstep of them in the Catena Græcorum Patrum. Justine Martyr indeed accused the Jews for rasing the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου out of the text. Ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνενηκος ὑπὸ μὲν Ἰαχμὺ ἡ δὲ ἀδελφὴ λεχθέντων λόγων λέγει βεβήχεν ἀφείλοντο, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου· εἰρημὸν δὲ τοῦ λόγου, εἴπατε ἐν τῇ θύρῃ. Οὐκ εἰς ἡ βασιλεύσειν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, ἀφ᾽ ἧσαν εἴπατε ἐν τῇς ἐθνεσιν, Οὐκ εἰς ἡ βασιλεύσειν. But first he doth not accuse them for rasing it out of the Originall Hebrew, for his discourse is onely to shew that they abus'd the LXX. Secondly, though the Jews had, rased it out of their own, it appeareth not how they should have gotten it out of the Bibles in the Christians hands, in which those words are not to be found.

† Zach. 12. 10. These words of Zachary are clear in the Originall יְהוָה יִרְמֵן פָּנָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, although the LXX. have made an other sense, ἐμβλέψονται πρὸς με εἰς δὲ ὧν κατωργήσωμεν, by translating ἰρמן פָּנָה εἰς δὲ, eo quod, as also the Chaldee Paraphrase ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ, with the Arabick version; and the Syriack another yet, by rendring it per eum quem, as if they should look upon me, and pierce another: yet the plain construction of יִרְמֵן פָּנָה, is nothing else but quem, relating to the person in the affix of the precedent יִרְמֵן, who being the same with him who immediately before promiseth to poure upon man the Spirit of grace, must needs be God. Which that the Jews might avoid, they read it not יִרְמֵן but יִרְמֵן, not on me, but on him, to distinguish him whom they were to pierce, from him who was to give the Spirit of Grace. But this fraud is easily detected, because it is against the Hebrew Copies, the Septuagint, and Chaldee Paraphrase, the Syriack and Arabick translations. Nor can the Rabins shift this place, because it was anciently by the Jews interpreted of the Messias, as themselves confesse. So R. Solomon Jarchi upon the place, ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ, Our Masters have expounded this of the Messias the Son of Joseph. That they interpreted it therefore of the Messias, is granted by them; that any Messias was o'the Son of Joseph, is already denied and refuted: it remaineth therefore that the ancient Jews did interpret it of the true Messias, and that S. John did apply it to our Saviour according to the acknowledged exposition. And in Bereshith Rabba we are clearly taught thus much; for unto that question, Who art thou, O great mountain? Zac. 4. 7. he answereth, ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ, the great mountain is the Messias the Son of David. And he proves it from, Grace grace unto it, ܐܝܢܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ, because he giveth grace and supplications, as it is written Zach. 12. 10.

shewes that he speaks of the Son of God, which was to be the Son of man, and by our nature liable to vulneration;

a Psal. 22. 17.
*This Translation indeed
 seemes some-
 thing different
 from the He-
 brew Text as
 now we read
 it, כָּאֵר וְרִי
 כָּאֵר וְרִי sicut
 leo, manus
 meas & pedes
 meos. But it
 was not always
 read as now it
 is. For R. Ja-
 cob the son of*

Chajim in Massoreth magna, מְעַרְכָּת אֹתוֹ וְהֵאָלֵף, ordine אֵל, testifieth that he found כָּאֵר וְרִי in some correct copies כָּאֵר, written in the Text כָּאֵר, but כָּאֵר read, and therefore written in the margin כָּאֵר. The same is testified by the Masorah on Num. 24. 9. citing the words of this Text, and adding כָּאֵר וְרִי. and Johannes Isaac Levita confirmeth it by his own experience, who had seen in an ancient Copy כָּאֵר in the text, and כָּאֵר in the margin. It was anciently therefore without question written כָּאֵר, as appeareth not only by the LXX. who translated it εἰς πυγὰς, foderunt, and Aquila, who rendered it ἡγογγα, fœdarunt, in the same sense with that of Virgil,

Obscurnas pelagi ferro fœdare volucres.

and the old Syriac, which translateth it כָּאֵר transfixerunt; but also by the last, or marginal Masorah, which noteth that the word כָּאֵר is found written alike in two places, this and Esay 38. 18. but in diverse significations. Wherefore being in Esay it manifestly signifieth, sicut leo, it must not signifie the same in this, and being the same themselves pretend to nothing else, it followeth that it be still read as it was, כָּאֵר, and translated foderunt. From whence it also appeareth that it is was one of the 18. places, which were altered by the Scribes.

† For the Masorah in severall places confesseth that 18. places in the Scriptures have bin altered by the Scribes, and when they come to reckon the places, they mention but 16. the other two without question are those concerning the crucifixion of the Messias, Psal. 22. 17. and Zach. 12. 10. For that of Zachary, a Jew confessed it to Mercerus; and that of David we shewed before to be the other.

It was therefore sufficiently adumbrated by types, and promulgated by prophecies, that the promised Messias was to be crucified. And it is as certain that our Jesus, the Christ

Christ whom we worship, and from whom we receive that honour to be named Christians, was really & truly crucified. It was first the wicked designe of Judas, who betrayed him to that death: it was the malicious cry of the obdurate Jews, crucifie him, crucifie him. He was actually condemned and delivered to that death by Pilate, who gave sentence that it should be as they required: he was given into the hands of the souldiers, the † Instruments commonly used in inflicting that punishment, who led him away to crucifie him: he underwent those previous paines which customarily antecede that suffering, as * flagellation, and bearing of the Crosse; for a Pilate when he had scourged Jesus, delivered him to be crucified: b and he bearing his Crosse went forth into Golgotha. They carried him forth out of the city, as by "custome in that kind of death they were wont to doe, and there between two malefactors, .i. usually by the Romans condemned to that punishment, they crucified him. And that he was truly fastened

Mat. 26. 2.

Joh. 19. 16.

Luc 23. 24.

Mat. 27. 31.

† That the souldiers did execute the sentence of death given by the Roman Magistrates in their provinces, and not onely in the Camp, is evident out of the Historie of that Nation.

* Sciendum est, Romanis Pilatum legibus ministrasse, quibus sancitum est, ut qui crucifigitur, prius flagellis verberetur. S. Hieron. ad Mat. 27. 26. To which Lucian alludes in his own condemnation: Έμοι μὲν ἀνεσκολοπήσαι δοκῆ αὐτόν, νῦν δὲ, μαστιγώσεται γὰρ πρὸς τέρεν. Lucian. in Pistatore. Multi occisi, multi capti, alii verberati crucibus affixi. Liv. l. 34. And l. 28. Ad palum deligatus, lacerato virgis tergo, cervicem cruci Romanæ subijciam. So Curtius reports of Alexander: Omnes verberibus affectos sub ipsis radicibus Petræ crucibus jussit affigi. Thus were the Jews themselves us'd, who caus'd our Saviour to be scourg'd and crucified: μαστιγώσας δὲ πρὸς βασιλικῶν τῶν δυνάτεων αἰχῶν ἀνεσώρευτο. Joseph. Lucian. l. 5. c. 32. a Mat. 27. 26. b Joh. 19. 17. " This was observed both by the Jews and Romans, that their capitall punishments were inflicted without their cities. And that particularly was observed in the punishment of Crucifixion. Plautus,

Credo ego isthuc exemplo tibi

Esse eundem aditum extra urbem dispelsis manibus,

Paribulum cum habebis.

Tally, Cum Mamertini more atque instituto suo crucem fixissent post urbem in via Pompeia.

.i. Thieves and Robbers were usually by the Romans punished with this death. Thus Cæsar us'd his Pirates, τὸ ἀγρὸς ἀπαιτῶν ἀνεσώρευον. Plut. in Vita. Imperator provincię jussit Latrones crucibus affigi. Petron. Satyr. Latronem istum, miserorum pignorum meorum peremptorem, cruci affigatis. Apuleius de Aur. Ass. l. 3, Latrocinium fecit aliquis, quid ergo meruit? ut suspendatur.

tur. Sen. Epist. 7. *Where suspendi is as much as crucifigi, and is so to be understood in all Latine authors which wrote before the dayes of Constantine.* Famolos latrones in his locis ubi grassati sunt furca figendos compluribus placuit colligi. l. 38. de pœnis, *where furca figendos is put for crucifigendos, being so altered by Tribonianus, who because Constantine had taken away the punishment, took also the name out of the Law.*

Joh. 20. 25.

27.

† This was the peculiar Heresie of Basilides, a man so ancient, that he is ascribed to follow Glaucias as his Master, who was the Disciple of S. Peter. And

Irenæus hath declared this particularity of his: Quapropter neque passum esse, & Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portasse crucem ejus pro eo, sed hunc secundum ignorantiam & errorem crucifixum transfiguratum ab eo, uti putarent ipsi esse Iesus, & ipsum autem Iesum Simonis accepisse formam, & stantem irridentem. Adv. Hæc. l. 1. c. 23. and Tertullian of the same Basilides. Hunc, (Christum) passum à Judæis non esse, sed vice ipsius Simonem crucifixum esse: unde nec in eo credendum esse qui sit crucifixus, ne quis confiteatur in Simonem credidisse. De Præsc. adv. Hæc. c. 46. From these is the same delivered by Epiphanius Hæc. 24. and by S. Aug. Hæc. 4.

fastened to the Crosse, appears by the satisfaction given to doubting Thomas, who said, *Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nayles, and put my finger into the print of the nayles, I will not believe:* and our Saviour said unto him, *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands;* whereby he satisfied the Apostle, that he was the Christ, and us, that the Christ was truly crucified: against that fond & Heresie which made Simon the Cyrenæan not onely bear the Crosse, but endure crucifixion, for our Saviour. We therefore inferre this second conclusion from the undoubted testimonies of his followers, and unfeigned confessions of his enemies, that our Jesus was certainly and truly crucified, and did really undergoe those sufferings, which were pretypified and foretold, upon the Crosse.

Being thus fully assured that the *Messias* was to be, and that our Christ was truly crucified; it thirdly concerns us to understand what was the nature of crucifixion, what the particularities of suffering which he endured on the Crosse. Nor is this now so easily understood as once it was. For being a *Roman* punishment, it was continued

in that Empire while it remained heathen; but when the Emperours themselves received Christianity, and the towering eagles resign'd the flags unto the Crosse, this punishment was † forbidden by the supreme authority, out of a due respect and pious honour to the death of Christ. From whence it came to passe, that since it hath been disused universally for so many hundred yeares, it hath not bin so rightly conceived as it was before, when the generall practice of the world did so frequently represent it to the Christians eyes. Indeed if the word which is used to de-

† This is observed by S. Austin, Serm. 18. de Verbis Dom. Quia ipse honoraturus erat fideles suos in fine hujus sæculi, prius

honoravit crucem in sæculo, ut terrarum principes credentes in eum prohiberent aliquem nocentium crucifigi. And Tract. 36. in Joh. speaking of this particular punishment; Modo in pœnis reorum non est apud Romanos: ubi enim Domini crux honorata est, putatum est quod & reus honoraretur si crucifigeretur. Whence it appears, first, that in the dayes of S. Austin Crucifixion was disused: secondly, that it was prohibited by the secular Princes. But when it was first prohibited, or by whom, he sheweth not. It is therefore to be observed, that it was first forbidden by the first Christian Emperour, Constantine the Great: of whom Sozomenus gives this relation; Ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τε καὶ νενομοθετημένῳ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῷ τῷ αὐτοῦ πρῶτῳ νόμῳ ἀπέλαβε ἡ χριστιανικὴ διουσιελών. l. 1. c. 2.

note that punishment did sufficiently represent or express it, it were enough to say that Christ was crucified: but being the most usuall or * originall word doth not of it self declare the figure of the tree, or manner of the suffering, it will be necessary to represent it by such expressions as we find partly in the Evangelicall relations, partly in such representations as are left us in those Authors whose eyes were daily witnesses of such executions.

* The Originall word in the New Test. for the tree on which our Saviour suffer'd is *σάωγες*, and the action or

crucifixion *σάωσις*, the active *σάωζεν*, and the passive *σάωσθαι*. Now *σάωγες*, from which the rest mentioned are manifestly derived, hath of it self originally no other signification then of a stake. As we find it first us'd by Homer,

Ὀδυσ. Ε'. Σταυρὸς δ' ὀκτὸς ἔλασσε διαμπερὲς ἔνδο καὶ ἔνδο, Πυκνὸς καὶ θαμνός, τὸ μέλαν δρυὸς ἀμφιχεύσας.

Ἐ. Ἰλίου. ω'. Ἀμφὶ δ' οἱ μεγάλῃ αὐλῇ ποιεῖ ἄναξ ἑσταυρόσιν πυκνοῖσι.

FFF 3

These

These are the same which Homer elsewhere calls σκόλοπες, and the ancient Grammarians render each by other. As Eustathius, Σταυροί, ὁρᾷ καὶ ἀποξυμμένα ξύλα, οἱ δ' αὖτοὶ καὶ σκόλοπες λέγονται, ἀφ' ὧν τὸ ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι, καὶ ἀνασταυρῆσθαι. so he expounding σταυρός, and in the same manner expounding σκόλοπες, λέγοντες ὅτι οἱ τοῦτοι σκόλοπες καὶ σταυροί, ἐκ τούτων τὸ ἀνασκολοπιζέσθαι καὶ ἀνασταυρῆναι. In the same manner Hesychius, Σταυροί, οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοποι, χαλκαίαι. and, Σκόλοπες, ὁρᾷ (i. ὁρᾷ) καὶ ὁξεία ξύλα, σταυροί, χαλκαίαι. Besides they all agree in the same Etymology, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵστασθαι, and therefore always take it for a straight standing stake, pale or palisadoe. Thus Καλόντες in Antiphon are briefly rendered ὁρᾷ ξύλα. but more expressly thus by Etymologus; Καλόντες, καλῶς οἱ ἰσότητι, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰ καταπεπηγότες ξύλα, αὐτὰ καὶ σταυροί καλοῦσι. This is the undoubted signification of σταυρός, in vain denied by Salmasius, who will have it first to signify the same with furca, and then with crux, first the figure of T, and then of Γ. Whereas all antiquity renders it no other then as a straight and sharp stake. In which signification it came at first to denote this punishment, the most simple and prime σταυρωσις or ἀνασκολοπισις being upon a single piece of wood, a defixus & erectus stipes. And the Greeks which wrote the Roman history, used the word σταυρός as well for their palus, as their crux. As when Antony beheaded Antiochus the King of the Jews, Dion thus begins to describe his execution, Ἀντίχονον ἐμασίησεν σταυρῷ προσδένων. not that he crucified him, as Baronius mistakes; but that he put him to another death after the Roman custome, as those dyed in Livy, l. 28. Deligati ad palum, virgisque cæsi, & securi percussi: so that σταυρῷ προσδένων is ad palum deligare. Thus were the heads of men said ἀνασταυρῶσθαι, as of Niger and Albinus in Dio and Herodian; which cannot be meant but of a single palus: and we read in Ctesias how Amytis put Inarus to death, ἀνασταυρῶσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τρισὶ σταυροῖς, not that he crucified him upon three crosses, but pierc'd his body with three stakes fastened in the ground, and sharp'd at the upper end; as appears by the like Persian punishment inflicted by Parysatis on Mesabates, delivered by Plutarch in Artaxerxe, προσέταξεν ὁρᾷ ἐπὶ ζῶντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα πλάγῳ διὰ τριῶν σταυρῶν ἀναπύξαι, τὸ δὲ ἄρμα χεῖρας διαπύλασθαι. which the Latine Translator renders in tres sustolli cruces, (a thing impossible) whereas it was to be transversely fastened to three stakes piercing the body lying, and thrust down upon them; which in the Excerpta of Ctesias is deliver'd only in the word ἀνασταυρῶσθαι.

The form then of the Crosse on which our Saviour suffered was not a simple but a compounded figure, according to the custome of the Romans, by whose Procurator he was condemn'd to dye. In which there was not only a straight and erected piece of wood fixed in the earth, but also a † transverse beam fastened unto that towards the

† That the Figure and parts of a Roman Cross, such as that was on

which our Saviour suffered, may be known, we must begin with the first composition in the frame or structure of it. And that is the conjunction of the two beams, the one

top
cross

cross, the other transverse; the first to which the body was applied, the second in which the hands were fastened. These two as the chief parts of the Crosse are severally ways expressed. First, by the Jews, who had no one word in their language particularly to express that punishment, (as being not mentioned in the Law, or at all in use amongst them,) and therefore call it by a double name, expressing the conjunction of these beams, אָרְבַּע יָמִין stamen & subtegmen, the warp and the woof. The Greeks express the same by the letter Tau, as partly appears by what is already spoken of the number 300. and is yet more evident by the testimony of Lucian, who makes mankind complain of the letter Tau, because Tyrants in imitation of that first made the Crosse. $\text{τὸ δὲ τὸ τε σῶμα τὴν παρὰ τοῦ τυράννου ἀκολυθώματος καὶ μνηστικῆς τὸ πλάσμα, ἔπειτα ῥῆματι τοῖς τοῦ ξύλου τεκμήριον ἀνθρώπου ἀσασκολοπήσειν ἐπ' αὐτά.}$ Jud. Vocal. Ipsa est enim litera Græcorum Tau, nostra autem T, species crucis. Tertul. adv. Marc. l. 3. c. 22. S. Jerome affirms the same of the Samaritan Tau; but there is no similitude to be found in that which is now in use, or any other Oriental, only in the Coptick Alphabet Salebdi, that is the crosse Di. These two parts of the Crosse are otherwise expressed by the mast and yard of a ship. So Justine Martyr; $\text{Θάλασσα μὲν καὶ τὸ πῦρ, ἢν μὴ τὸ τοῦ τριπόρου ὁ καλῶνται ἴσον ἐν τῇ νηὶ οὐκ ἔστιν.}$ and Tertullian; Antenna navis crucis pars est. and Minutius Felix; Signum sane Crucis naturaliter visimus in navi, cum velis tumentibus vehitur. and Max. Taurin. Cum à nautis scinditur mare, prius arbor erigitur, velum distenditur, ut cruce Domini facta aquarum fluentia rumpantur. Now because the extremities of the Antenna are a kind of κέρτα (as Virgil that great master of proprieties, Cornua velatarum obvertimus antennarum,) therefore in Greek κεφαλα is antennarum and from hence the Greek Fathers applied the words of our Saviour, Mat. 5. 18. $\text{ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν κεφαλαὶ καὶ μὴ παράλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ὡς ἐν παντί ᾠόντες,}$ to the Crosse of Christ; $\text{τὸ δὲ σωρῶν, ἵνα τὰ ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ ξύλον, καὶ κεφαλαὶ τὸ πλάγιον.}$ Because ἵνα is like the straight piece or mast of the crosse, and κεφαλα the yard or transverse part, therefore some of the Ancients interpreted this place of the Crosse, says Theophylact on the place. and Gregor. Nyssen l. 2. de vita Moïsis; $\text{Ἀληθῶς καὶ τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν διωμένοις ἐν τῷ νόμῳ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὸν σωρὸν θεωρεῖται μυστήριον. Διό οὕτως τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ὅτι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τὸ ἵνα καὶ ἡ κεφαλαὶ ἐπαρέρχεται. σημαίνει διὰ τοῦ ὁρημένων τὴν τε ἐν πλαγίῳ γραμμὴν, καὶ τὴν κείνου, δι' ἧν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ σωρὸν καταρχοῖται.}$ Not that this is the true interpretation of that place, for κεφαλα signifies a part of a letter, as in Apollonius Syntax. l. 1. 7. $\text{τὸ αὐτὴν κεφαλαὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ}$ but by that they testify their apprehension of the figure of a Crosse. And this similitude of the Mast and Yard leads to the consideration of that part of the crucified pale which was eminent above the transverse beam. For as the καρχήσιον was above the κεφαλα , so the stipes did extend it self above the patibulum. And this is evident by those expressions which make the two beams have four sides, and four extremities, as two lines cutting each other at equal angles needs must have. These Theophanes and Gregory Nyssen call $\text{τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου τέσσaras πρὸς βολὰς,}$ Damascen $\text{τὰ τέσσαρα ἅκρα τοῦ σωρῶς διὰ τοῦ μέσου κέντρου κεκλιμένα καὶ συσφίγγοντα.}$ Hence Nonnus calls the Crosse δρυ τετραπλάγον. And of these 4. parts the Fathers interpret the height, and breadth, and length, and depth, mentioned by S. Paul

S. Paul *Eph.* 3. As Gregory Nyssen: Ἐπεὶ οἱ τὴν τὸ παρ' διακρουσάν τε καὶ συν-
 ἔχοντα δισσάμιν τὴν χήματι τὴν σαυρὴ καταχράσθαι ... ὅψον καὶ βάθος καὶ πλάτος
 καὶ μήκος κατονομάζων, ἐκείνῳ κερταίνοντι τὸ χήμα τὴν σαυρὴ διαρρυθμίζον
 ἰδίῳις περισσαστρέφον ὀνόμασιν· ὡς τὸ μὲν ἄνω μέρος ὅψον εἶπεν, βάθος
 τὸ κατὰ τὴν συμβολὴν ὑποκείμενον, τὴν δὲ ἐξέχρυστον κατὰ ἐκτερεῖν κερταίνον
 τὴν μήκος τὴν πλάτος ὀνόματι διασημαίνων. *Contra Eunom. Orat.* 4. & *idem*
Catech. Orat. c. 32. & *in Resurr. Orat.* 1. And S. Augustine makes the same in-
 terpretation; In hoc mysterio figura crucis ostenditur; which he thus expresseth, La-
 titudo est in eo ligno quod transversum desuper figitur; ... longitudo in eo
 quod in ipso ligno usque ad terram conspicuum est; ... altitudo est in ea ligni
 parte quæ ab illo quod transversum figitur sursum versus relinquitur, hoc est ad corpus
 crucifixi, &c. *E. i. 20.* & alibi sæpe. These 4. parts are severally express'd by the
 Ancients, and particularly by the figure of a man with his hands stretch'd forth; which
 is the most proper similitude, because the Crosse was first made and adapted to that
 figure. Quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur, quod humerorum obliquatio
 cornuat, si statueris hominem manibus expansis, imaginem crucis feceris. *Tertull.*
adv. Nat. l. 1. c. 12.

* Beside the
 direct and
 transverse part
 of the Crosse
 with their 4.
 extremities,
 which onely
 usually are con-
 sidered, and
 represented in
 the figures, we

top thereof; and beside these two cutting each other trans-
 versely at right angles (so that the erected part extended it
 self above the transverse) there was also another * piece
 of wood infixed into and standing out from that which was
 erected and straight up. To that erected piece was his bod-
 dy, being lifted up, applied, as *Moses* serpent to the pole;
 and to the transverse beam his hands were nail'd : upon the
 lower part coming out from the erected piece his sacred bod-
 dy rested, and his feet were transfix'd and fasten'd with
 nailes : his head being press'd with a Crown of thorns, was
 applied

must find yet another part, and a fifth extremity. Irenæus giving severall examples
 of the number 5. delivers it plainly thus, l. 2. c. 42. Ipse habitus crucis fines &
 summitates habet quinque, duos in longitudine, duos in latitudine, & unum
 in medio, ubi requiescit qui clavis affigitur. Beside therefore the 4. extremities of
 the direct & transverse beams, there was a fifth extremity in medio, (viz. of the erected po-
 lus) on which the crucified body rested. This fifth part of the Crosse fasten'd to the ex-
 ecutioner's stipes was before Irenæus acknowledged and described by Just. Martyr under
 the notion of the horn of the Rhinoceros, taken to be a figure or type of the Crosse. Μο-
 νοκέραν γὰρ κέρατα ἑξ ἑνὸς ἀπὸ πλάγματος ἢ χήματος ἔχει ἄν τις εἰσὶν καὶ
 ἀποδείξει, εἰ μὴ τὸ τύπον τὸν σαυρὴν δείκνυσιν. ὁρῶν γὰρ τὸ ἐν ᾧ ἐξέλασ-
 ατο ἔδει τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρατα ὑπορρυθμίζον, ὅταν τὸ ἀπὸ ἐξέλασ-
 ατο δὴ καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα τὸ ἐνὶ κέρατι παρελθόντα τὰ ἄκρα φάσιν,
 καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον ὡς κέρατα καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον εἶναι, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐπὶ χεῖρας
 σαυρὴ.

ἡ βλάστησις καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ αὐτὸ αὐτοῖς κέσται ἡ ζωοποιότης αὐτοῦ. Dial. cum Tryphone. Where beside the ὀρθὸν ξύλον, or erecta-
 rius stipes, and the ὁγὼ ξύλον, or transversarium lignum, there is a βλάστης, τὸ ἐν
 μέσῳ πρυμνίζον, fastened in the middle; ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοντο οἱ σωτῆρες, says Irenæus. So Tertullian, l. 1. adv. Natio-
 nes, c. 13. Pars crucis, & quidem major, est omne robur quod directâ statione de-
 signatur. Sed nobis tota crux imputatur, cum antennâ scilicet suâ, & illo sedili
 cunctu. Where the excessus is the τὸ ἐξέχον, signifying the nature, as the sedi-
 le signifieth the use of the part. Which in another place, in imitation of Justinus, he
 refers unto the Typicall Unicorn. Nam & in antennâ navis, quæ crucis pars est,
 extremitates cornua vocantur; Unicornis autem medio stipite palus. Adv. Mar-
 tinum. l. 3. c. 18. & Adv. Jud. c. 10. To this sedile in the cross Moctenas seems to
 allude in those words in Seneca, Hanc mihi vel acuta subsidem cruce sustine. And
 Seneca himself does expound him; Sulfugas licet & acutam sessuro crucem subdas,
 et tanti vulnus suum premere, & patibulo pendere districtum. Epist. 101. Of
 this Innocentius the first also speaks Sermon. 1. de uno Marty. Fuerunt in Cruce Do-
 minica ligna quatuor; stipes erectus, & lignum transversum, truncus suppositus,
 & circulus superpositus. This Gregorius Turonensis, after the use of the Cross was
 long omitted, interpreted of suppedaneum, a piece of wood fastened under the feet
 of him that suffered. De glo. Marty. c. 6. Clavorum ergo Dominicorum gratia
 quod quatuor fuerint hæc est ratio. Duo sunt affixi in palmis & duo in plantis;
 & queritur cur plantæ affixæ sint, quæ in cruce sancta dependere visæ sunt potius
 quam stare. Sed in stipite erecto foramen factum manifestum est. Pes quoque par-
 vule tabellæ in hoc foramen insertus est. Super hanc vero tabulam tanquam stan-
 ti hominis sacræ affixæ sunt plantæ.

applied to that part of the erect which stood above the trans-
 verse beam; and above his head to that was fastened the

Table on which was written, in Hebrew, Greek, and La- * That which
 tine Characters, the accusation, according to the Roman was written o-
 custome: and the writing was, JESUS OF NA- ver the head of
 ZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. our Saviour is
 called simply by

Thus S. Luke ἐμ-

γραφῇ, by S. Matthew αἰτία, by S. Mark ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας, and by S. John
 τίτλος. From all which we may collect, that there was an Inscription written over
 the head of our Saviour, signifying the accusation and pretended crime for which he
 was condemned to that death. Glossæ Vet. Αἰτία, causa, materia, titulus. In the
 language of Suetonius, Titulus, qui causam poenæ indicavit. This was done accor-
 ding to the Roman custome, as we read in Dio l. 54. of the son of Cæpio, τὸν δὲ
 ἐν τῇ περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δίδ τε τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέσης μετὰ γραμμάτων, τὴν αἰτίαν
 τῆς καταποσίως αὐτοῦ ἐν δολώσων, διαγράψαντες, & μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνασυνέστησαν.
 This title was written upon a table, and that table fastened to the upper part of the
 Cross. The Syriack, Arabick, and Persian Translations render τίτλος expressly a
 Table.

Table. And Hefychius, Τίτλϑ, *ἡνυχον ἐπιγραμματα ἔχον*, (not *ἔχον*, as it is printed) not the Inscription it self, but that upon which the Inscription was written. Thus the Epistle of St. French unto the Christians in Asia represents the Inscription of the Martyr Attalus in a Table: *ἑρμαχθεὶς κύκλῳ τῷ ἀμφιδότῳ, πίνακ' αὐτῷ περὶ ἔχοντ' ὃν ὁ ἐπιγράψας Ῥωμαῖσι, οὐτός ἐστιν Ἀττάλ' ὁ Χριστιανός*. Euseb. l. 5. c. 1. And Sozomen describing the invention of the Crosse by Helena, says there were three severall crosses in the same place; *καὶ χωρὶς ἄλλο ξύλον ἐν μέρει λευκώματ' ῥήματα καὶ γεγραμμένα Ἑβραϊκοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς τε καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς*. This Nicephorus call λευκὴν σκίδα, which is the proper interpretation of λευκώμα. Suidas, λευκώμα, τίχϑ (Etymol. πίναξ) γύψῳ ἀληθοσιμῶν περὶ γεγραμμένων πραγμάτων ἐπιτίθει. Hefyc. Σανὶς, δῦρα, λευκώμα (as Julius Pollux joins σκιδες and λευκώμα together,) ὃν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀθήνην ἐγέγραπτο περὶ τοῦ κακέρους. τίθειται δ' ἐπὶ ταύτῃ, leg. σωρεύ. His meaning is, that such a λευκώμα as contained the accusation or crime of malefactors was placed upon the crosse on which they suffered: and without question he spake this in reference to our Saviours crosse, because he used in a manner the same words with St. John: τίθει ἐπὶ τῷ σωρεύ, says Hefyc. ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τῷ σωρεύ, saith St. John. It was therefore a Table of wood whitened and fastened to the top of the Crosse, on which the Accusation or Crime was written, as it is expressed by Nicephorus. Σανὶς λευκὴ ἢ βασιλὶα ἔστι Ἰουδαίων γραφῶν ὁ Πιλάτ' ὡς ἐκ καρπῆς ἐτίθει, ὃν εἶδε σῆλως βασιλὶα ἔστι Ἰουδαίων τὸν σωρεύοντα ἀνεγέρων. Hist. Eccl. l. 8. 29.

Thus by the propriety of the punishment, and the titular inscription, we know what crime was then objected to the immaculate Lamb, and upon what accusation Pilate did at last proceed to passe the sentence of death upon him. It was not any opposition to the law of Moses, nor any danger threatened to the Temple, but pretended sedition, and affectation of the Crown objected, which moved Pilate to condemn him. The Jews did thus accuse him, *a We found this fellow perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that he himself is Christ a King*. And when Pilate sought to release him, they cryed out saying, *b If thou let this man go: thou art not Caesars friend: whosoever maketh himself a King speaketh against Caesar*. This moved Pilate to passe sentence upon him, and, because that punishment of the Crosse was by the † Roman custome used for that crime, to crucifie him.

a Luc. 23. 2.

b Joh. 19. 12.

† Auctores seditionis aut tumultus, pro qualitate dignitate, aut in cruce tolluntur, aut bestiis obijciuntur. *Paulinus* l. 5, tit. 32.

Two

Two things are most observable in this Crosse; the acerbity, and the ignominy of the punishment: for of all the Roman wayes of execution it was † most painfull, and most shamefull. First, the exquisite paines and torments in that death are manifest, in that the hands and feet, which of all the parts of the body are most nervous, and consequently most sensible, were pierced through with nayles; which caused, not a suddain dispatch, but a lingering & tormenting death. Insomuch that the Romans, who most us'd this punishment, did in their language deduce their expressions of paines and * cruciation from the Crosse. And the acerbity of this punishment appears, in that those who were of any mercifull disposition would first cause such as were adjudged to the Crosse to be slain, and then to be crucified.

† Illa morte pejus nihil fuit inter omnia genera mortium. S. August. in Joh. Tract. 36. Tully calls it crudelissimum terribilissimumque supplicium; and Ausonius, pœnæ extremum. * Ubi dolores acerrimi exagitant, cruciatus vocatur, à cruce

nominatus; pendentes enim in ligno crucifixi, clavis ad lignum pedibus manibusque confixi, producta morte necabantur. Non enim crucifigi hoc erat occidi, sed diu vivebatur in cruce; non quia longior vita eligebatur, sed quia mors ipsa protendebatur, ne dolor citius finiretur. S. Aug. Tract. in Johan. 36. To this Etymology did Terence allude in those words, & illis crucibus, quæ nos nostramque adolescentiam habent despiciant, & quæ nos semper omnibus cruciant modis.

As it was observed of Julius Cæsar; Piratas à quibus captus est, cum in ditio-nem redeisset, quoniam suffixurum se cruci ante juraverat, jugulari prius iussit, deinde suffigi. Suet. l. 1.

As this Death was most dolorous and full of acerbity, so was it also most infamous and full of ignominy. The Romans themselves accounted it a † servile punishment, and inflicted it upon their slaves and fugitives. It was a high crime to put that dishonour upon any free man; and the

† Vulcatius Gallicanus relates of Avidius Cassius, in the case of some

centurions which had been prosperous, but in fighting without Orders given; Rapi eos iussit, & in crucem tolli, servilique supplicio affici, quod exemplum non exarabam. And Juvenal speaks with relation to this custome, Pone crucem servo. So Palæstrio in Plautus, Nisi quidem illa nos volt, qui servi sumus, Propter suum amorem omnes crucibus contrubemales dari. And again, Noli minitari, scio crucem futuram mihi sepulchrum. Ibi majores mei firi sunt, pater, avus, proavus, abavus. So in Terence, P. am. Quid meritis es? D. Crucem. and Horace, Si quis cum servum

patinam qui tollere iussus, Semefos pisces, tepidumque ligurrierit jus, In cruce suffigat. So Capitolinus of Pertinax, in crucem sublati talibus servis; and Herodian of Macrinus, δ' αλοι οσοι δεσποτας καθ' ἡγελλον ἀνεσπολοπιδνη. This Punishment of the Crosse did so properly belong to the slaves, that when servants and free-men were involved alike in the same crime, they were very carefull to make a distinction in their death, according to their condition: ut quisque liber aut servus, suæ fortunæ quoque sumptum supplicium est. Liv. l. 3. And then the Servants were always crucified. As Servius observes among the Lacedæmonians: Servos patibulis suffixerunt, filios strangulavere, nepotes fugaverunt. Æneid. 3. Novercæ quidem perpetuum indicitur exilium, servus vero patibulo suffigitur. Apul. Metam. l. 10. Thus in the combustion at Rome upon the death of Julius Cæsar; Ἀμυνόμενοι ἀνεσπολιδνησθαι, καὶ συλληφθέντες ἔτεροι ἐκρεμάσθησθαι οσοι δεσποταίης ηῖν, οἱ δ' ἐλευθέρων ἡγεμονίᾳ χρημὲν κατέρριπθη. Appia. de Bell. civil. l. 3. Ea nocte speculatores prehensi servi tres, & unus ex legione vernacula: servi sunt in crucem sublati, militiæ vicibus abscissæ. Hist. l. de Bell. Hispan. So Africanus: gravius in Romanos quam in Latinos transfugas animadvertit; illos enim, tanquam patriæ fugitivos, crucibus affixit; hos, tanquam perfidos socios, securi percussit. Valer. Max. l. 2. This punishment of the crosse was so proper unto Servants, that servile supplicium in the language of the Romans signifies the same: & though in the words of Vulcatius before cited, they goe both together, as also in Capitolinus, Nam & in crucem milites tulit, & servilibus suppliciis semper affecit; yet either is sufficient to expresse crucifixion: as in Tacitus, malam potentiam servili supplicio expiavit, Hist. 4. and again, Sumptum de eo supplicium in servilem modum, Hist. 2. And therefore when any servant, were made free, they were put out of fear of ever suffering this punishment. An vero servos nostros horum suppliciorum omnium metu dominorum benignitas una vindicta liberabit, vos à verberibus, ab unco, crucis denique terrore, neque res gestæ, neque acta ætas, neque nostri honores vindicabunt? Cic. Orat. pro Rabir.

† Carnifex, & obductio capitis, & nomen ipsum crucis, absit non modo à corpore

greatest indignity which the most undeserving † Roman could possibly suffer in himself; or could be contrived to shew their detestation to such creatures as were below humane nature. And because when a man is beyond possibility

civium Romanorum, sed etiam à cogitatione, oculis, auribus. Harum enim omnium rerum non solum eventus atque perperessio, sed etiam conditio, expectatio, mentio denique, indigna cive Romano atque homine libero est. Cic. Orat. pro Rabir. Facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare; particidium necesse: quid dicam in crucem tollere, crudelissimum terribissimamque supplicium? verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest. Idem §. in Verrem. † A. when the Capitoll was betray'd by the silence of dogs; but preserved by the noise of geese, they preserved the memory by a solemn honouring of the one yearly, and dishonouring the other. Eadem de causa supplicia annua canes pendunt, inter alia Iunonis & Summani vivi in furca sambuoca à bore fixi. Plin. l. 29. c. 4. Πονηρὸν μὲν

ἡ γὰρ ἐν τῇ μνήμῃ τῷ τότε συμπαράποντι τῷ τόχῃ, πᾶσι μὲν ἀνίσταται, καὶ ἡ μὲν σφραγὶς ἐπὶ τῇ σφραγίδι πολυτελεῖς καὶ φορεῖα καθήκοντα. *Platarch. de Fort. Rom.*

bility of suffering pain, he may still be subject to ignominy in his fame; when by other exquisite torments some men have tasted the bitterneſſe of death, after that they have in their † breathleſſe corps by vertue of this punishment ſuffered a kind of ſurviving ſhame. And the expoſing the bodies of the dead to the view of the people on the Croſſe hath bin thought a ∴ ſufficient ignominy to thoſe which dyed, and terrour to thoſe which liv'd to ſee it. Yea where the bodies of the dead have bin out of the reach of their ſurviving enemies, they have thought it highly opprobrious to their ghoſts, to take their representations preſerved in their “ pictures, and affix them to the Croſſe.

† *As Orceus the Perſian, when he had treacherouſly & cruelly murder'd Polyocrates the Tyrant of Samos, ἀποκτείναντά μιν ἐκ ἀξίας ἀνιγνῆσθαι ἐπαύρωσι. Herod. l. 3. So*

Antiochus firſt cut off the head of Achæus, and then faſtened his body to a Croſſe. *Εδοξε φθῶν μὲν ἀκρωτίζειν τὸν Τάχην, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμόντα αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ὅσον ἀνακαταβῆναι τὸ σῶμα.* This was the deſign of Tarquinius Priſcus, when the extremity of labour which he laid upon his ſubjects made many lay violent hands upon themſelves; Paſſim conſcita nece Quiritibus tædium fugientibus, novum & inexcogitatum antea poſtea, que remedium invenit ille Rex, ut omnium ita deſunctorum figeret crucibus corpora, ſpectanda civibus ſimul, & ſeris volucribusque laceranda. *Plin. l. 36. 15. Who makes this handſome obſervation of it; Quamobrem pudor Romani nominis proprius, qui ſæpe res perditas ſervavit in præliis, tunc quoque ſubvenit; ſed illo tempore impoſuit, tum erubescens cum puderet vivos, tanquam puditarum eſſet extinctos.*

“ Thus they uſed Celfus, one of the 30. Tyrants of Rome, as Trebellius Pollio teſtifieth: Novo injuriæ genere imago in crucem ſublata, perſultante vulgo, quaſi patibulo ipſe Celfus videretur affixus.

It is neceſſary we ſhould thus profeſſe faith in Chriſt crucified, as that puniſhment which he choſe to undergoe, in that way which he was pleas'd to dye. Firſt, becauſe by this kind of death we may be aſſured that he hath taken upon himſelf, and conſequently from us, the maleſtation of the Law. For we were all under the curſe; be-

- Deut. 27. 26. cause it is expressly written, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them*: and it is certain none of us hath so continued; for the *Scripture hath concluded all under sin*, which is nothing else but a breach of the Law: therefore the curse must be acknowledged to remain upon all. But now *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*; that is, he hath redeemed us from that generall curse, which lay upon all men for the breach of any part of the law, by taking upon him that particular curse, laid onely upon them which underwent a certain punishment of the Law. For it was written, *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*. Not that Suspension was any of the Capitall punishments prescribed by the law of *Moses*; not that by any tradition or custome of the *Jews* they were wont to punish their malefactors with that death: but such as were punished with death according to the law or custome of the *Jews*, were for the enormity of their fact oftentimes after death expos'd to the ignominy of a gibbet; and those who † being dead were so hanged on a tree, were accursed by the law. Now though Christ was not to dye by the sentence of the *Jews*, who had lost the supreme power in death, and thou hang him on a tree. In which words, being put to death precedeth being hanged. But I confesse, in our English translation it hath another sense, [and he be to be put to death,] as if he were to dye by hanging. And so the *Vulgar Latine*, *Et adjudicatus morti appensus fuerit patibulo*; as if he were adjudged to be hanged, and so his sentence were suspension. But there is no such sentence contained in the *Originall*, as the *Vulgar*, nor futurity of death, as our English Translation mentio- neth. The Hebrew is *מוֹתָא* in *Hophal*, that is, *interfectus, occisus, mori factus fu- erit*; or, as the *LXX.* clearly translate it, *ἐπεμνήσθη*.

causes capitall, and so not to be condemned to any death according to the law of *Moses*; yet the providence of God did so dispose it, that he might suffer that death which did contain in it that ignominious particularity to which the legall curse belonged, which is *the hanging on a tree*.
For

For he which is crucified, as he is affixed to, so he hangeth on the crosse: and therefore true and formall crucifixion is often named by the generall word † suspension; and the Jews themselves doe commonly call our blessed Saviour by that very "name to which the curse is affix'd by Moses.

† As we before noted on the words of Seneca: Thus the Greeks do of-

ten use *κρεμάω* for crucifigere. For Curtius speaking of the taking of Tyre by Alexander, says, Duo millia crucibus affixa per ingens littoris spatium pependunt. and Diodorus Siculus relating the same, Τὸς ὁ νῦν πύλῳς ὄντας ἐκ ἐλαφύς ἡρώδου ἀποκρίσας ἐκρέμασαν. And the same Curtius testifies that Musicanus was in crucem sublatu: of whom Arrianus speaks thus, οὗτον κρεμάσαν Ἀλέξανδρος κατέκτανεν τῇ αὐτοῦ γῇ. Thus in the language of the Scriptures, οἱ τρεῖς κρεμαδέντων κακῶν is one of the crucified thieves, Luc. 23. 39. and the Jews are said to have slain our Saviour κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλῳ, Act. 5. 30. & 10. 39. The Latines likewise often use the word suspendere for crucifigere. As Ausonius in the Idyllium whose title is Cupido cruci affixus, describes him thus, Hujus in excelsu suspensum stipite Amorem. And when we read in Polybius, that they did ἀνασταυρῶσαι τὸ σῶμα of Archæus; Ovid describes his punishment thus,

Mor e vel intereas capti suspensus Achæi,
Qui miser aurifera teste pependit aqua.

The words of Moses are Deut. 21. 23. קללת אלהים תלוי, maledictio Dei suspensus: and this word תלוי, which is of it self simply suspensus, as 2 Sam. 18. 10. I saw Absalon באלה תלוי hinged on an oak, is ordinarily attributed by the Jews to our Saviour, to signifie that he was crucified. Hence they term Christians עובדי צלוחי cultores suspensi: and they call the Crucifix תלוי צלוחי figuram suspensi.

Secondly, it was necessary to expresse our faith in Christ crucified, that we might be assured that he hath abolished in his flesh the enmity, ev'n the law of commandments; which if he had not done, the strength and power of the whole law had still remain'd. For all the people had said Amen to the Curse, upon every one that kept not the whole law, and entred into a curse, and into an oath to walk in Gods law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and doe all the commandments of the Lord their God, and his judgements and his statutes. Which was in the nature of a Bill, Bond, or Obligation perpetually standing in force against them, ready to bring a forfeiture or penalty upon them, in case of non-performance of the

Eph. 2. 15.

Deut. 27. 26.

Neh. 10. 29.

Col. 2. 14.

the condition. But the strongest Obligations may be cancelled; and one ancient custome of cancelling bonds was, by striking a nail through the writing: and thus God, by our crucified Saviour, *blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Crosse.*

Rom. 6. 5, 6.

Thirdly, hereby we are to testify the power of the death of Christ working in us after the manner of crucifixion. For we are to be *planted in the likenesse of his death*: and that we may be so, we must acknowledge, and cause it to appear, that *our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed*: we must confesse, that *they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts*, and they which have not, are not his. We must not glory, *save in the crosse of our Lord Jesus Christ*: nor can we properly glory in that, except *by the world be crucified unto us, and we unto the world.*

Gal. 6. 14.

Fourthly, by the acerbity of this passion we are taught to meditate on that bitter cup which our Saviour drank; and while we think on those nailes which pierced his hands and feet, and never left that torturing activity till by their dolorous impressions they forced a most painfull death, to acknowledge the bitterness of his sufferings for us, and to assure our selves that by the * worst of deaths he hath overcome all kinds of death; and with patience and cheerfulness to endure whatsoever he shall think fit to lay upon us, who with all readinesse and desire suffered farre more for us.

* Mori voluit pro nobis, parū dicimus: crucifigi dignatus est; u'que ad mortem crucis obediens factus, elegit extremum & pessimum genus mortis, qui omnem fuerat ablaturus mortem: de morte pessima occidit omnem mortē. S. Aug. Tract. 36. in Johan. † Phil. 2. 7, 8.

Lastly, by the ignominy of this punishment, and universall infamy of that death, we are taught how farre our Saviour descended for us, that while we were slaves and in bondage unto sinne, he might redeem us by a servile death: for he *made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and so he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the crosse*: teaching us the glorious doctrine of

† humility,

humility, and patience in the most vile and abject condition which can befall us in this world; and encouraging us to imitate him *a who for the joy that was set before him, endured the crosse, despising the shame; and will deliver us from that fearfull sin of falling from him, least we should be crucified unto our selves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame; & so become worse then the Jews themselves, who crucified the Lord of life without the walls of Jerusalem, and for that unparalleld sin were delivered into the hands of the Romans, into whose hands they delivered him, and at the same walls in such multitudes were crucified, . . . till there wanted room for crosses, and crosses for their bodies.*

And now we have made this discovery of the true manner and nature of the crosse on which our Saviour suffered, every one may understand what it is he professeth when he declareth his faith, and saith, I believe in Christ crucified. For thereby he is understood and obliged to speak thus much: I am really perswaded, and fully satisfied, that the onely begotten and eternall son of God, Christ Jesus, that he might cancell the hand-writing which was against us, and take off the curse which was due unto us, did take upon him the form of a servant, and in that form did willingly and chearfully submit himself unto the false accusation of the Jews, and unjust sentence of Pilate, by which he was condemned, according to the Roman custome, to the Crosse; and upon that did suffer that servile punishment of the greatest acerbity, enduring the pain, and of the greatest ignominy, despising the shame. And thus I believe in Christ crucified.

D E A D.

THough Crucifixion of it self involveth not in it certain death, and he which is fastened to a Crosse is so likely to dye, as that he being taken from the same may

H h h

live;

† Humilitatis enim magister est Christus, qui humiliavit seipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. S. Aug. in Johan.

Tract. 51.

a Heb. 12. 2.

b Heb. 6. 6.

. . . Jos. de Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 28.

Προσῆλυν ὁ οἱ στρατιῶν δὲ ὄργην καὶ μῆσος τῶν ἀλόντας ἄλλον ἄλλω ἡμιματι πρὸς χλευῖν καὶ διατὸ πλῆθος χώρα τε ἐνελάπετο τοῖς σώμασιν, καὶ σώμασιν τοῖς σώμασιν.

live; though when the insulting *Jews* in a malicious derision call'd to our Saviour to *save himself*, and *come down from the Crosse*, he might have come down from thence, and in saving himself have never saved us; yet it is certain that he felt the extremity of that punishment, and fulfill'd the utmost intention of Crucifixion: so that, as we acknowledge him *crucified*, we believe him *dead*.

For the Illustration of which part of the Article, it will be necessary, First, to shew that the *Messias* was to dye; that no sufferings, howsoever-shamefull or painfull, were sufficiently satisfactory to the determination and predictions divine, without a full dissolution and proper death: Secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, did not onely suffer torments intolerable and inexpressible in this life; but upon and by the same, did finish this life by a true and proper death: Thirdly, to declare in what the nature and condition of the death of a person so totally singular did properly and peculiarly consist. And more then this cannot be necessary to shew we believe that *Christ was dead*.

1 Cor. 15. 3.

Heb. 11. 17.

First then, we must consider what *S. Paul* delivered to the *Corinthians* first of all, and what also he received, how that *Christ dyed for our sinnes according to the Scriptures*; that the *Messias* was the *Lamb slain before the foundations of the world*, and that his death was severally represented and foretold. For though the sacrificing *Isaac* hath been acknowledged an expresse and lively Type of the promised *Messias*; though after he was bound and laid upon the wood, he was preserved from the fire, and rescued from the religious cruelty of his father's knife; though *Abraham* be said to have offered up his *only-begotten Son*, when *Isaac* dyed not; though by all this it might seem foretold that the true and great promised seed, the *Christ*, should be made a sacrifice for sin, should be fastened to the Crosse, and offer'd up to the Father, but not suffer death: yet being *without effusion*

son of blood there is no remission, without death no sacrifice for sin, being the saving of *Isaac* alive doth not deny the death of the Antitype, but rather suppose and assert it, as prefiguring his resurrection from the dead, from whence *Abraham* received him in a figure; we may safely affirm the ancient and legall Types did represent a Christ which was to dye. It was an essentiall part of the Paichall Law, that the Lamb should be slain: and in the sacrifices for sin, which prefignified a Saviour to arise the people with his own blood, the bodies of the beasts were burnt without the camp, and their blood brought in to the Sanctuary.

Nor did the Types onely require, but the Prophecies also foretell his death. For he was brought, saith *Isaiah*, *Isa. 53. 7, 8, 10.* as a Lamb to the slaughter: he was cut off out of the land of the living, saith the same Prophet, and made his soul an offering for sin. Which are so plain and evident predictions, that the *Jews* shew not the least appearance of probability in their evasions.

† That this place of *Isaiah* must be under-

stood of the *Messias*, I have already proved against the *Jews*, out of the Text, and their own Traditions. Their objection particularly to these words is, that the land of the living is the land of *Canaan*. So *Solomon Jarchi*, מִדְּבַר אֶרֶץ חַיִּים הוּא אֶרֶץ, from the land of the living, that is, the land of *Israel*. And *D. Kimchi* endeavours to prove that exposition out of *David*, כִּי נִגְדָה מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּאֶרֶץ חַיִּים, as if the land of the living must be the land of *Canaan*, because *David* professeth he will walk before the Lord in the land of the living; whereas there is no more in that phrase, but that he will serve God while he liveth. As *Psal. 27. 13.* I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodnesse of the Lord in the land of the living: and *Isa. 38. 11.* I said, I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord in the land of the living; which is sufficiently interpreted by the words which follow, I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world. The land of the living then was not particularly the land of *Canaan*; nor can they perswade us that it could not reserre to Christ, because he was never removed out of that land: but to be cut off out of the land of the living is, certainly, to be taken away from them which live upon the earth, that is, *Jews*.

Being then the obstinate *Jews* themselves acknowledge one *Messias* was to dye, and that a violent death; being we

have already prov'd, there is but one *Messias* foretold by the Prophets, and shewed by those places which they will not acknowledge, that he was to be slain; it followeth, by their unwilling confessions and our plain probations, that the promised *Messias* was ordain'd to dye: which is our first assertion.

1 Cor. 5. 7.

Secondly, we affirm, correspondently to these Types and propheties, that *Christ our Paschever is slain*, that he whom we believe to be the true and onely *Messias* did really and truly dye. Which affirmation we may with confidence maintain, as being secure of any even the least denyall. Jesus of *Nazareth* upon his crucifixion was so surely, so certainly dead, that they which wished, they which thirsted for his blood, they which obtain'd, which effected, which extorted his death, even they believ'd it, even they were satisfied with it: the Chief-Priests, the Scribes and the Pharisees, the Publicans and Sinners, all were satisfied; the Sadduces most of all, who hugg'd their old opinion, and lov'd their error the better, because they thought him sure for ever rising up. But if they had denyed, or doubted of it, the very stones would cry out and confirm it. Why did the Sun put on mourning, why were the graves open'd, but for a funerall? Why did the earth quake, why were the rocks rent, why did the frame of nature shake, but because the God of nature dyed? Why did all the people who came to see him crucified, and love to feed their eyes with such Tragick spectacles, why did they beat their breasts and return, but that they were assured *it was finished*, there was no more to be seen, all was done? It was not out of compassion that the merciesse souldiers brake not his legs, but because they found him dead whom they came to dispatch; and being enraged that their cruelty should be thus prevented, with an impertinent villany pierce his side, and with a foolish revenge endeavour to kill a dead man: thereby becoming stronger witnesses than they would, by being lesse the authors

dours then they desir'd, of his death. For out of his sacred,
 but wounded, side came blood and water, both as evident
 signes of his present death, as certain seals of our future and
 eternall life. These are the two blessed Sacraments of the
 Spouse of Christ, each assuring her of the death of her
 beloved. The Sacrament of Baptism, the water through
 which we passe into the Church of Christ, teacheth us
 that he dyed to whom we come. *For know you not, saith*
S. Paul, that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus
Christ, are baptized into his death? The Sacrament of the
 Lords supper, the bread broken, and the wine pour'd forth,
 signifie that he dyed which instituted it; and *as often as we*
eat this bread and drink this cup, we shew forth the Lords
death till he come.

Dead then our blessed Saviour was upon the Crosse; and that not by a feign'd or metaphoricall, but by a true and proper death. As he was truly and properly man, in the same mortall nature which we the sons of Adam have, so did he undergoe a true and proper death, in the same manner as we dye. † Our life appeareth principally in two particulars, motion and sensation; and while both or either of these are perceived in a body, we pronounce it lives. Not that the life it self consisteth in either or both of these, but in that which is the originall principle of them both, which we call the soul; and the intimate presence or union of that soul unto the body is the life thereof. The reall distinction of which soul from the body in man our blessed Saviour taught most clearly in that admonition, ** Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* Now being death is nothing else but the privation or * recession of life, and we are then properly said to dye when we cease to live; being life consisteth in the union of the soul unto the body, from whence, as from the fountain, flow motion, sensation, and whatsoever vitall perfection; death can be

Rom. 6. 3.

I Cor. II. 26.

† Τὰ ἐμφύχον
τῶ ἐμφύχον δι-
οῖν μέλισσα
διαφέρειν δι-
κεῖ, καὶ σφτε
καὶ τῶ ἀνδρῶ-
ν. παρὰ τὴν
φύσιν ὅτι καὶ
ἐν τῇ φύσει περ-
χόμενων δι-
οῖν δι' οὗ ταύ-
τα περὶ φύχων.
Aniſt. de ani-
ma, l. i. c. 2.

τὸ διαφέρει
 τὰ ἄψυχα
 (leg. ἔμψυχα)
 τῶν ἀψύχων,
 τὸ τοῦ ἄψυχου.
 διαφέρει τὸ κιν-
 ῆσθαι αὐτῶν,
 φαντασία, νοή-
 σις. Sal. H. de
 Diis & Mun-
 do, c. 8.

a Mat. 10. 28.

* *As Secundus,*
 ουγι η' ο' π' ο'-
 κτησις βίβ.

† As the Philosophers have anciently expressed it, especially Plato, who by the advantage of an error in the Original of souls, best understood the end of life. T 76

γε ψυχᾷ τῷ ὀνομαζέσθαι, λύσις καὶ χειρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος. in Phædone.
 ἔπειτα, Ὁ θάνατος τῆς ψυχῆς ὧν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἐστὶν ἄλλο ἢ διελθὲν περὶ ψυχῆς
 διάλυσιν, τὴν ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπὸ ἀλλήλων. in Gorgia. And more plainly and
 fully yet, Ἡ γυνὴ μὲν πρὶν θάνατον εἶναι; Πάντῃ, ἔστιν ὑπολαμβάνει ὁ Σωκράτης.
 Ἄρα μὴ ἄλλο τι ἢ πῶς τὴν ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγὴν; καὶ εἶναι τὴν πνεύ-
 ναν, χωρὶς μὴ ἀπὸ τὴν ψυχῆς ἀπαραχρῆσθαι αὐτὸ καὶ εἶναι τὸ σῶμα γινώσκειναι, χω-
 ρὶς ὅτι τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀπαραχρῆσθαι αὐτὴν καὶ αὐτὴν εἶναι; Ἄρα μὴ ἄλλο
 τι ἢ ὁ θάνατος ἢ τῆτο; Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τῆτο, ἔφη. in Phædone. Thus with 4. or
 several words, λύσις, διάλυσιν, χειρισμὸς, and ἀπαραχρῆσθαι, doth Plato expresse the
 separation of the soul from the body, and maketh death formally to consist of that se-
 paration: which is far more philosophicall then the notion of Aristotle, who maketh
 it to consist in the corruption of naturall heat. Ἀνδρῶν τε τοῖσι καὶ τῶν ζῶντων
 καὶ τὴν τῶν θερμῶν φυσικὴν συνείδειαν, καὶ τὸν καλέμενον θάνατον εἶναι τὴν τῆτο
 φθορὰν. in Parv. Natural. in as much as the soul is not that naturall heat, and the
 corruption of that heat followeth upon the separation of the soul.

Nor is this onely our conception, or, a doubtfull truth; but we are as much assured of the propriety of his death, as of the death it self. For that the unspotted soul of our Jesus was really and actually separated from his body, that his flesh was bereft of naturall life by the secession of that soul, appeareth by his own resignation, *Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit*; and by the Evangelist's expression, *and having said thus, he † gave up the ghost*.

Luc. 23. 46.

† This is ex-
press'd three
ways, all fig

finding the separation of his soul from his body. S. Mark and S. Luke ἐξέρχοντο, which is of the same force with ἐξέλθω. But because ἐκλύχειν doth not always signify an absolute expiration, but sometimes a lipothymy only; as Hesychius, 'Εκλύχειν, ληποθυμῆσαι' so Hippocrates useth it, Εἰσὶν ὃ ὀξύτατοι (καὶ) ὀσσεῖ ἢ ἐκλύχουσι δὴ τι ὠφελησάν, i. e. de Morbis, an. agerit, 'Εκλύχουσι ὃ διὰ τὴν αἵματι

ψυματὸ τὴν μετασυσιν ἔχειν νομίζω: lest therefore we should take ἐξέ-
 ἤδη in such an imperfect sense, S. Matth. bath it ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, and S.
 John, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Which is a full expression of the secession of the soul
 from the body, and consequently of death, which is, in the language of Secundus,
 ψυματὸ ἀπέσπασις.

When he was to dye, he resigned his soul; when he gave it
 up, he dyed; * when it was delivered out of the body,
 then was the body dead: and so the eternall Son of God
 upon the crosse did properly and truly dye.

* These three
 points or distin-
 ctions of time
 I have therefore
 noted, that I

might occur to any objection which possibly might arise out of the ancient Philo-
 sophy, which Aulus Gellius reports to be agitated at the table of Taurus. The
 Question was propounded thus, Quæritur est, quando moriens morietur, cum
 jam in morte esset, an tum etiam cum in vita foret. Where Taurus admonisheth
 the rest, that this was no light question; for, sayes he, gravissimi Philosophorum su-
 per hac re serio quæsierunt; & alii moriendi verbum atque momentum manente
 adhuc vita dici atque fieri putaverunt, alii nihil in illo tempore vitæ reliquerunt,
 totumque illud quod mori dicitur morti vendicarunt. The ancient Philosophers
 were divided, some saying a man dyed in the time of his life, others in the time of his
 death. But Plato observed a contradiction in both; for a man can neither be said to
 dye while he is alive, nor when he is dead: & idcirco peperit ipse aliud quoddam no-
 men in confinio tempus, quod verbis propriis atque integris τὴν ἐξαίρεσιν εὖσιν
 ἀπελάττειν, ὥς ἐξ ἐκείνου μεταβάλλον ὡς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας. Thus A. Gellius, l. 6. c. 13.
 Thus when our Saviour commended his soul into the hands of his Father, he was yet
 alive; when the souldier pierced his side, he was already dead: and the instant in which
 he gave up the Ghost, was the τὸ ἐξαιρεσιν when he dyed.

This reality and propriety of the death of Christ is yet
 further illustrated from the cause immediately producing
 it, which was an externall violence and cruciation, suffi-
 cient to dissolve that naturall disposition of the body
 which is absolutely necessary to continue the vitall union of
 the soul: the torments which he endured on the Crosse
 did bring him to that state, in which life could not longer
 be naturally conserved, and death, without intervention of
 supernaturall power, must necessarily follow.

For Christ, who took upon him all our infirmities, sin
 onely excepted, had in his nature not onely a possibility
 and.

& aptitude, but also a necessity of dying; & as to any extrinsecall violence, able according to the common course of nature to destroy and extinguish in the body such an aptitude as is indispensably required to continue in union with the soul, he had no naturall preservative; nor was it in the power of his soul to continue it's vitall conjunction unto his body bereft of a vitall disposition.

Joh. 10. 18.

It is true that Christ did voluntarily dye, as he said of himself, *No man taketh away my life from me, but I lay it down of my self: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* For it was in his power whether he would come into the hands of his enemies; it was in his power to suffer or not to suffer the sentence of Pilate, and the nailing to the Crosse; it was in his power to have come down from the Crosse, when he was nailed to it: but when by an act of his will he had submitted to that death, when he had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of his soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigour was totally exhausted. So not by a necessary compulsion, but voluntary election, he took upon him a necessity of dying.

Mar. 15. 44.

'Tis true that *Pilate marvelled* he was dead so soon, and the two thieves lived longer to have their legs broken, and to dye by the accession of another pain; but we read not of such long furrows on their backs as were made on his, nor had they any such kind of agony as he was in the night before. What though *he cryed with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost?* what though the *Centurion* when he saw it said, *Truly this man was the Son of God?* the miracle was not in the death, but in the voice: the strangeness was not that he should dye, but that at the point of death he should cry out so loud: he dyed not by, but with a miracle.

Mar. 15. 37. 39.

Should we imagine Christ to anticipate the time of death, and to subtract his soul from future torments necessary

cessary to cause an expiration; we might rationally say, the *Jews* and *Gentiles* were guilty of his death, but we could not properly say they slew him: guilty they must be, because they inflicted those torments on which in time death must necessarily follow; but slay him actually they did not, if his death proceeded from any other cause, and not from the wounds which they inflicted: whereas *S. Peter* expressly chargeth his enemies, *Him ye have taken, & by wicked hands have crucified and slain*; and again, *The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree*. Thus was the Lamb properly slain, and the *Jews* authors of his death, as well as of his crucifixion.

A& 2. 23.

A& 5. 30.

Wherefore being Christ took upon himself our mortality in the highest sense, as it includeth a necessity of dying; being he voluntarily submitted himself to that bloody agony in the garden, to the hands of the plowers who made long their furrowes, and to the nailes which fastened him to the Crosse; being these torments thus inflicted and continued did cause his death, and in this condition *he gave up the ghost*; it followeth, that the onely-begotten son of God, the true *Messias* promised of old, did dye a true and proper death. Which is the second Conclusion in this Explication.

But thirdly, because Christ was not onely man, but also God, and there was not onely an union between his soul and body while he lived, but also a conjunction of both natures, and an union in his person; it will be further necessary, for the understanding of his death, to shew what union was dissolved, what continued; that we may not make that separation either lesse or greater then it was.

Whereas then there were two different substantiall unions in Christ, one of the parts of his humane nature each to other, in which his humanity did consist, and by which he was truly man; the other of his natures humane and divine, by which it came to passe that God was man,

and that man God : first, it is certain, as we have already shew'd, that the union of the parts of his humane nature was dissolved on the Crosse, and a reall separation made between his soul and body. As far then as humanity consists in the essentiall union of the parts of humane nature, so far the humanity of Christ upon his death did cease to be, and consequently he ceased to be man. But secondly, the union of the natures remained still as to the parts, nor was the soul or body separated from the divinity, but still subsisted as they did before by the subsistence of the second person of the Trinity.

The truth of this assertion appeareth, first from the language of this very † Creed. For as we prov'd before, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, God of God, very God of very God, was *conceiv'd*, and *born*, and *suffer'd*, and that the truth of these propositions relyed upon the communion of properties, grounded upon the hypotactical union : so while the Creed in the same manner proceedeth speaking of the same person, that he *was buried*, and *descended into hell*, it sheweth that neither his body, in respect of which he was buried, nor his soul, in respect of which he was generally conceiv'd to descend into hell, had lost that union.

ibi intellige & verbum & animam & carnem. Sed utique confiteris etiam illud quod habet eadem Fides, in eum Christum te credere qui crucifixus est & sepultus. Ergo etiam sepultum Christum esse non negas, & tamen sola caro sepulta est. Si enim erat ibi anima, non erat mortuus; si autem vera mors erat, & ejus vera sit resurrectio, sine anima fuerat in sepulchro, & tamen sepultus est Christus. Ergo Christus erat etiam sine anima caro, quia non est sepulta nisi caro. S. August. in Joh. Tract. 48.

Again, as we believe that God redeemed us by his own blood, so also it hath bin the constant language of the Church, that God dyed for us; which cannot be true, except the soul and body in the instant of separation were united to the Deity.

Indeed, being all the gifts of God are without repentance,

ance, nor doth he ever subtract his grace from any without their abuse of it, and a sinfull demerit in themselves; we cannot imagine the grace of union should be taken from Christ, who never offended, and that in the highest act of obedience, and the greatest satisfaction to the will of God.

'Tis true, Christ cryed upon the crosse with a loud voice saying, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But if that dereliction should signifie a solution of the former union of his natures, the separation had bin made not at his death, but in his life. Whereas indeed those words inferre no more, then that he was bereft of such joyes and comforts from the Deity, as should assuage and mitigate the acerbity of his present torments.

It remaineth therefore that when our Saviour yielded up the ghost, he suffered onely an externall violence; and what was subject to such corporall force did yield unto those dolorous impressions. Being then such is the imbecility and frailty of our nature, that life cannot long subsist in exquisite torments; the disposition of his body fail'd the soul, and the soul deserted his body. But being no power hath any force against omnipotency, nor could any corporall or finite agent work upon the union made with the Word, therefore that did still remain entire both to the soul and to the body. The Word was once indeed without either soul or body; but † after it was made flesh, it was never parted either from the one or from the other.

† This is the conclusion of S. August. Ex

quo Verbum caro factum est, ut habitaret in nobis, & susceptus est à Verbo homo, id est totus homo, anima & caro, quid fecit passio, quid fecit mors, nisi corpus ab anima separavit? animam vero à Verbo non separavit. Si enim mortuus est Dominus sine dubio caro ipsius expiravit animam (ad tempus enim triguum anima deseruit carnem, sed redeunte anima resurrecturam) à Verbo suam animam separatam esse non dico. Latronis animæ dixit, Hodie mecum eris in paradiso; fidelem latronis animam non deserebat, & deserebat suam? absit: sed illius ut Dominus custodivit, suam vero inseparabiliter habuit. Si autem dixerimus, quia ipsa se anima posuit, & iterum ipsa se sumpsit, absurdissimus sensus est: non enim quæ à Verbo non erat separata à seipsa potuit separari. Tract. in Job. 47.

Thus Christ did really and truly dye, according to the condition of death, to which the nature of man is subject; but although he was more then man, yet he dyed no more then man can dye: a separation was made between his soul and body, but no disunion of them and his Deity. They were disjoyned one from other, but not from him that took them both together; † rather by vertue of that remaining conjunction they were again united after their separation. And this I conceive sufficient for the third and last part of our explication.

† Ἐπειδὴ δι-
πλωτὸν μὲν ἦν
ἀνθρώπινον
σώμαμα, ἀ-
πλὴν δὲ τοῦ μονο-
θεοῦς ἡ τῆς δι-

έτητος φύσεως, ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς διαζεύξεως ἡ (ὡς
διαζεύξετο) τῷ ζωοῦντι τὸ ἀδιαίρετον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἑμπαλιν γίνετο. τῇ δὲ ἐνότητι
τῆς θεϊκῆς φύσεως, τῆς χριστοῦ ἐν ἀμφοτέροις ἔσεως, πάλιν πρὸς ἀλλήλας τὴ δι-
σύντη συμφοῦνται. Greg. Nyss. Orat. i. de Resurr. Tam velox incorruptæ carnis
vivificatio fuit, ut major ibi esset soporis similitudo quam mortis, quoniam De-
itas quæ ab utraque suscepti hominis substantia non recessit, quod potestare divi-
fit, potestate conjunxit. Leo Sermon. i. de Resurr.

The necessity of this part of the Article is evident, in that the death of Christ is the most intimate and essential part of the Mediatorship, and that which most intrinsically concerns every office and function of the Mediator, as he was Prophet, Priest, and King.

First, it was necessary, as to the Prophetical office, that Christ should dye, to the end that the truth of all the doctrine which he delivered might be confirmed by his death: he was the true and faithfull witness, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession. This is he that came by water and blood: and there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood. He preached unto us a new and better covenant, which was established upon better promises, and that was to be ratified with his blood; which is therefore called by Christ himself the blood of the new Testament, or everlasting Covenant: for that covenant was also a testament; and where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. Beside Christ, as a Prophet, taught us not onely by word, but by

Rev. 3. 14.

1 Tim. 6. 13.

1 Joh. 5. 6, 8.

Heb. 8. 6.

Mat. 26. 28.

Luc. 22. 20.

Heb. 10. 29.

and 13. 20.

Heb. 9. 16.

by example; and though every action of his life, who came to fulfill the law, be most worthy of our imitation, yet the most eminent example was in his death; in which he taught us great variety of Christian vertues. What an example was that of faith in God, *to lay down his life that he might take it again*, in the bitterneſſe of his torments to commend his ſpirit into the hands of his Father, and for the joy that was ſet before him to endure the croſſe, and deſpiſe the ſhame? What a pattern of meekneſſe, patience, and humility, for the Son of man to come not to be miniſtered unto, but to miniſter, and to give his life a ranſome for many? to be led like a ſheep to the ſlaughter, and like a lamb dumb before the ſhearer, not to open his mouth? to endure the contradictions of ſinners againſt himſelf, and to humble himſelf unto death, even the death of the croſſe? What a precedent of obedience, for the Son of God to learn obedience by the things that he ſuffered, to be made under the Law, and though he never broke that law, to become obedient unto death, to goe with chearfulneſſe to the croſſ upon this reſolution, as my Father gave me commandment, even ſo I doe? What exemplar of Charity, to dye for us while we were yet ſinners & enemies, when greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friends; to pray upon the croſſe for them that crucified him, and to apologize for ſuch as barbarouſly flew him, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they doe? Thus Chriſt did ſuffer for us, leaving us an example that we ſhould follow his ſteps; that as he ſuffered for us in the fleſh, we ſhould arme our ſelves likewise with the ſame mind. For he that hath ſuffered in the fleſh hath ceaſed from ſin: that he no longer ſhould live the reſt of his time in the fleſh to the luſts of men, but to the will of God. And ſo his death was neceſſary for the confirmation and completion of his Prophetical Office.

Secondly, it was neceſſary that Chriſt ſhould dye, and by his death perform the Sacerdotall Office. For every

Joh. 10. 17.

Heb. 12. 2.

Mat. 20. 28.

Act. 8. 32.

Heb. 12. 3.

Phil. 2. 8.

Heb. 5. 8.

Phil. 2. 8.

Joh. 14. 31.

Rom. 5. 8.

Joh. 15. 13.

1 Pct. 2. 21.

4. 1, 2.

Heb. 5. 1.

Heb. 10. 4.

9.

Heb. 9. 22.

Isa. 53. 10.

1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Rom. 5. 10.

Col. 1. 21.

Heb. 9. 13, 14.

high-Priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts & sacrifices for sinnes. But Christ had no other sacrifice to offer for our sinnes then himself. For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sinnes: and therefore when Sacrifice and offering God would not, then said he, Loe, I come to do thy will, O God; then did Christ determine to offer up himself for us. And because the sacrifices of old were to be slain, and generally without shedding of blood there is no remission; therefore if he will offer sacrifice for sin, he must of necessity dye, and so make his soul an offering for sin. If Christ be our Pasche, he must be sacrificed for us. We were sold under sin, and he which will redeem us, must give his life for our redemption: for we could not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but onely with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot. We all had sinned, and so offended the justice of God, and by an act of that justice the sentence of death pass'd upon us; it was necessary therefore that Christ our surety should dye, to satisfy the justice of God, both for that iniquity, as the propitiation for our sinnes, and for that penalty, as he which was to bear our griefs. God was offended with us, and he must dye who was to reconcile him to us. For when we were enemies, saith S. Paul, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. We were sometimes alienated and enemies in our mind by wicked workes, yet now hath he reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death. Thus the death of Christ was necessary toward the great act of his Priesthood, as the oblation, propitiation and satisfaction for the sinnes of the whole world: and not onely for the act it self, but also for our assurance of the power and efficacy of it: For if the blood of bulls and goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; How much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternall Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge

urge our conscience from dead works? and of the happiness flowing from it; For he that spared not his own son, Rom. 8. 32. but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Upon this assurance founded on his death, we have the freedome and boldnesse to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh. Neither was the death of Christ necessary onely in respect of us immediately for whom he dyed, but in reference to the Priest himself who dyed, both in regard of the qualification of himself, and consummation of his Office. For in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a mercifull and faithfull High-Priest, and having suffered, being tempted might be able to succour them that are tempted: so that passing through all the previous torments, and at last through the paines of death, having suffered all which man can suffer, and much more, he became as an experimentall Priest, most sensible of our infirmities, most compassionate of our miseries, most willing and ready to support us under, and to deliver us out of our temptations. This being qualified by his utmost suffering, he was also fitted to perfect his Offering. For as the High-Priest Heb. 9. 7. once every year for the atonement of the sinnes of the people entered into the Holy of Holies not without blood; so Christ 11, 12. being come an High-Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands, by his own blood entred in once into the Holy place, having obtained eternall redemption for us. And this is the grand necessity of the death of Christ in respect of his Sacerdotall Office.

Thirdly, there was a necessity that Christ should dye in reference to his Regall Office. O King, live for ever, is either the loyall or the flattering vowe for temporall Princes; either the expression of our desires, or the suggestion of their own: whereas our Christ never shew'd more Sovereign

Col. 2. 15.

Heb. 2. 14.

1 Pet. 1. 11.

Psal. 110. 7.

Philip. 2. 8, 9.

Rom. 14. 9.

veraigne power then in his death, never obtained more then by his death. It was not for nothing, that Pilate suddenly wrote, and resolutely maintain'd what he had written, *This is the King of the Jews*. That title on the Crosse did signifie no lesse then that his Regall power was active even there: for *having spoyled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it; and through his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil*. Nor was his death onely necessary for the present execution, but also for the affecution of further power and dominion, as the means and way to obtain it. The Spirit of Christ in the Prophets of old testified before-hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. He shall drink of the brack in the way, saith the Prophet David; therefore shall he lift up his head. He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the crosse. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name. For to this end Christ both dyed and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

Thus it is necessary to believe and professe our faith in Christ who dyed: for by his blood and the verue of his death was our Redemption wrought, as by the price which was pay'd, as by the atonement which was made, as by the full satisfaction which was given, that God might be reconciled to us, who before was offended with us, as by the ratification of the Covenant made between us, and the acquisition of full power to make it good unto us.

After which Exposition thus premised, every Christian is conceiv'd to expresse thus much when he makes profession of faith in Christ Jesus which *was dead*. I do really and truly assent unto this, as to a most infallible and fundamentall truth, that the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, for the working out of our redemption, did in our nature, which he took upon him, really and truly dye, so

by the force and violence of those torments which he felt his soul was actually separated from his body; and although neither his soul nor body was separated from his divinity, yet the body bereft of his soul was left without the least vitality. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ which was crucified and dead.

AND BURIED.

When the most precious and immaculate soul of Christ was really separated from his flesh, and that union in which consisted his naturall life was dissolved, his sacred body, as being truly dead, was layd up in the chambers of the grave: so that as we believe him dead, by the separation of his soul, we also believe him buried, by the sepulture of his body.

And because there is nothing mysterious or difficult in this part of the Article, it will be sufficiently explicated when we have shew'd, first, that the promised *Messias* was to be buried, and secondly, that our Jesus was so buried as the *Messias* was to be.

That the *Messias* was to be buried, could not possibly be denied by those who believ'd he was to dye among the Jews, because it was the universall custome of that nation to bury their dead. We read most frequently of the sepulchres of their fathers: and though those that were

† It is observed by Tacitus of the Jews, in opposition to the

Roman cast me, Corpora condere, quam tremare, ē more Egyptio. Hist. l. 5. of the Egyptians, others, Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμεῖς τὰ ἐνταφιασμοῦ, Παιονες δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τὰς λήνας ἱσχυόμεθα. Laert. Pyrrh. But the Jews rectify'd this, assume no more from the Egyptians than from the Persians, whom they may be said to follow, because they used not the Egyptian τὰ ἐνταφιασμοῦ. neither were they more distinguished from the Romans than from the Grecians, who also burned the bodies of the dead. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐνταφιασμοῦ τὰς ψυχὰς, ὁ μὲν Ἑλλήνων ἔργον. ὁ δὲ Περσῶν ἔργον. ὁ δὲ Ἰνδῶν ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων ἔργον. ὁ δὲ Σικελῶν καὶ Ἰταλῶν τὰ ἐνταφιασμοῦ. Lucian. περὶ πνέοντος. Although therefore it be not true, that the Jews receiv'd their custome of burying their dead from the Egyptians, because Abraham as they purchased a burying-place; yet it hath bin observed, and is certainly true,

that it is generall custome was to interre. Philo, one of their own writers: Ἀρχαίοις καὶ πᾶσι χρεαίοις οἰκονότατον ἢ φύσιν χρεῖν ἀπέναιμα γλῶσσι, ὃ μόνον ζῆναι ἀπὸ καὶ ἀποθανῆναι, ἐν ἡ αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ ψυχῇ ἔχειν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ ψυχῇ ἀνάστασιν. l. 1. in Flaccū.

Mat. 12. 40.

Psal. 16. 9.

† So the Mishdrash Tillim anciently expounded it, My flesh shall rest in hope, מִן הַמָּוֶת

after death; adding, אֲרֵץ יִצְחָק מִלֵּמַד שְׁלֵא שְׁלֵט בּוֹ רֶמָה וְחֹלֶלֶת, that Rabbi Isaac said, he taught by these words, that the moth and worm should have no power over him. Whence by the Argument of S. Peter, it must be understood not of David, for his flesh saw corruption, nor of any other but the Messias. And although the Rabbins are wont to say that the worm shall never eat the just, in opposition to the last words of Esay; yet they must confesse there is no difference in the grave; and therefore that worm must signifie something else then the corruption of the body. well therefore are those words paraphrased by Didymus, ἐν ἁλμυρῇ καὶ τῷ σκώρῳ ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ὁ σκώρ καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις.

condemned by their supreme power were not buried in their Fathers graves, yet publick sepulchres there were appointed even for them to lye in; and not onely they, but all the Instruments which were used in the punishment, were buried with them. And yet beside the generall consequence of death among the Jews, there was a perfect type in the person of Jonas: for as that Prophet was three dayes and three nights in the whales belly, so was the Messias, or the Son of man, to be three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth. Nor was his Buriall onely represented Typically, but foretold Prophetically, both by a suppositive intimation, and by an expresse prediction. The Psalmist intimated and suppos'd no lesse, when speaking in the person of the Christ he said, *My flesh shall rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy one to see corruption.* That flesh is there supposed onely such, that is, a body † dead, and that body resting in the grave, the common habitation of the dead, yet resting there in hope that it should never see corruption, but rise from thence before that time in which bodies in their graves are wont to putrifie.

Beside this intimation there is yet a clear expression of the grave of the *Messias*, in that eminent prediction of

Isaiah

Isaiah, He was cut off out of the land of the living, and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death. For whatsoever the true interpretation of the Prophecy be, (of which we shall speak hereafter) it is certain that he which was to be cut off was to have a grave : and being we have already shewn, that he which was to be cut off was the *Messias*; it followeth, that by vertue of this prediction the promised *Messias* was to be buried.

Secondly, that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, was thus buried, we shall also prove, although it seem repugnant to the manner of his death. For those which were sentenc'd by the *Romans* to dye upon the Crosse, had not the favour of a sepulchre, but their bodies were † exposed to the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field, or, if they escaped their voracity, to the longer injury of the air and weather. A guard was

† To this *cu-*
some *Horace*
alludes, *Epist.*
16. l. 1. Non
also *hominem occi-*

di: non pascet in cruce corvos. and *Juvenal*, Vultur, jumento & canibus crucibusque relictis, Ad fatus properat, partemque cadaveris offert. So *Prudentius*, Crux illum tollat in auras, Viventesque oculos offerat alitibus, πρὸς τὸν ὕμνον. Hymn. 4. This punishment did appear in the Mythology of *Prometheus*; who though he were by some represented simply, as δεσμώτης; by others particularly he is describ'd as ἀνισταυρώμενος, especially by *Lucian*, who delivers him πρὸς ἀνίσταυρον, κραυγὰς, πρὸς ἀνίσταυρον, ἀνισταυρώμενον, ἀνισταυρώμενον, ἀνισταυρώμενον. And *Tertullian* speaking of *Pontus* from whence *Marcion* came; Omnia torpent, omnia rigent: nihil illis nisi feritas calet, quæ fabulas scenis dedit, de sacrificiis Taurorum, & amoribus Colchorum, & crucibus Caucaforum. Adv. Marcio. l. 1. c. 1. He touches the subject of three Tragedies, *Medea*, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and *Prometheus vinc-tus*, or rather crucifixus. As therefore the Eagle there did feed upon his liver, so were the bodies of crucified persons left to the promiscuous rapacity of carnivorous fowls. So true it was of the what *Augustus* once said, Cuidam sepulturam petenti respondit, jam illam in volucrum esse potestate. *Suet.* c. 13. Nor were they onely in the power of the fowls of the air, as *Prometheus* was, whom they durst not hang too low, lest men should succour him, ὅτι καὶ ταπεινὸν καὶ πρόσχειρον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ καὶ ἵκεν *Vulcan* in *Lucian* for that reason; but ordinarily they hung so low upon the Crosse, that the ravenous beast might reach them, as *Apuleius* describes Patibuli cruciatum, cum canes & vultures intima protrahunt viscera.

* So the bodies were often left upon the Crosse till the sun and rain had putrified and consumed them. As when the daughter of *Polycrates* did see her fathers face in a dream to be wash'd by *Jupiter*, and to be arched by the Sun, when he hung upon the Crosse, it was perform'd.

Πολυκράτης ὁ ἀνακράμει· ὁ πετέλει πᾶς τὴν ὄψιν τῆς θυγατρὸς· ἔλπει μὲν
 ὅτι καὶ τῷ Δίδω ὁκνεῖ· οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτι καὶ τῷ ἡλίῳ ἀνίει αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ σφύματι·
 ἔκκεται. Herod. Thalia. Of which Tertul. de anima, c. 46. Ut cum Polycrati Sa-
 mio filia crucem prospicit de Solis unguine & lavacro Jovis. And which is further
 thus express'd by Valerius Maximus: Putres ejus artus, & rabido cruore manantia
 membra, atque illam lavam cui Neptunus annulum manu piscatoris restituerat,
 sicu marcidam, Samos laxis oculis aspexit, l. 6. c. 9. Thus were the bodies of the
 crucified left, ut in sublimi putrescerent: and so they were left, as the Scythians
 usually did, according to the description of Silius Italicus, l. 13.

At gente in Scythica suffixa cadavera t uncis

Lenta dies sepelit, putri liquentia tabo.

Thus, whether by the fowls or beasts, or by the injury of time and weather, the flesh of
 those which were crucified was consum'd; as Artemidorus observ'd; who concluded
 from thence, that it was bad for the rich to dream of being crucified, Τὰς δὲ πλουσίους
 βλάπτει· γυμνοὶ δὲ σωρῶν, καὶ τὰς σάρκας ἀπολλύουσιν οἱ σωρῶσίντες. Oni-
 rocr. l. 2. c. 58.

† As appeareth alio usually fter about them, lest any pitying hand should
 by that Relati- take the body from the cursed tree, and cover it with earth.
 tion in Petroni-
 us Arbitr:

Imperator Provinciæ latrones jussit crucibus affigi . . . P. oxima autem nocte cum
 miles qui cruce affervabat ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detraheret, &c. And
 when that souldier was absent, Itaque cruciarii unius parentes, ut viderunt lau-
 tam custodiam, detraxere noctependentem, supremoque mandaverunt officio.
 where we see the souldier set for a guard, and the end of that custodia, (which the
 Greek Lexicographers do not well confine to the σφαγμα τοῦ δεσπομένης ὀφθαλμοῦ
 μύου) to keep the body of him which was crucified from being buried by his friends.
 Thus when Cleomenes was dead, his body was fastened to a Crosse (another example
 of the ignominy of this punishment) by the command of Ptolemey: Ὁ δὲ Πτολεμαῖος
 ὡς ἔγνω ταῦτα, προστάζει τὸ μὲν σῶμα τοῦ Κλεομένηος κραμεῖσθαι κατὰ βυρσοποι-
 τας. where κραμεῖσθαι is again to be observed as taken for ἀνεσπρωγῆσαι: for not
 long after in the same Author it follows, Ὁλίγαις δὲ ὕστερον ἡμέραις, οἱ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ
 Κλεομένηος ἀνεσπρωγμένον παραφύλασσόντες εἶδον ἐν μεγάλῃ δρᾶκοντα τῇ κεφαλῇ
 περιπελεγμένον, καὶ ἀποκρύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ὡς μὲν δὲν ὄρεον ἐπὶ τῷ σφαγ-
 ματι. where we see a guard set to keep him from buriall, and the voracious serps
 ready to seize on him; had they not bin kept off by a serpent involving his head. Thus
 were these souldiers upon the crucifixion of any person set as a guard, τὸν ἀνεσπρω-
 γμένον παραφύλασσόντες, ἢ τηρῶντες, & cruce affervantes, viz. ne quis ad se-
 pulturam corpus detraheret.

Under that custome of the Roman Law was now the
 body of our Saviour on the Crosse, and the guard was set,
 Mat. 27. 54. there was the Centurion, and they that were with him,
 watching Jesus. The Centurion returned as soon as Christ
 was

was dead, and gave testimony unto Pilate of his death: but the watch continueth still. How then can the ancient predictions be fulfill'd? how can this *Jonas* be convey'd into the belly of the whale? where shall he make his grave with the wicked; or, with the rich in his death of crucifixion? By the providence of him who did foretell it, it shall be fulfill'd. They which petition'd that he might be crucified, shall intercede that he may be interr'd. For the † custome of the *Jews* required, that whosoever suffered by the sentence of their law should be buried, and that the same day he suffered. Particularly they could not but remember the expresse words of *Moses*, *if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day.* Upon this generall custome and particular law, especially considering the sanctity of the day approaching, like *Jews*, that the bodies should not remain upon the Crosse on the Sabbath day, besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. And this is the first step to the buriall of our Saviour.

† מצות טשה
לקבור
כל הרוג בית
דין ביום
ההריגה:

Maimon. Tract.
Sanh. cap. 15.

So Josephus.

Τοσαύτως Ἰου-

δαίου πρεσ-

βυτέρης τὰς

ἐντολάς πο-

υμένων, ὅτι κα-

τὰ ἐκ κατα-

δίκης ἀνασ-

χυμένους πε-

ρὶ τῶν ἡλίων.

b Joh. 19:31.

ἀνατίθης καὶ δάμνηται. de Bel. Jud. l. 14. c. 13. a Deur. 21. 22, 23. For though by the common rule of the *Roman* law, those which were condemned to the crosse were to loose both soul and body on the tree, as not being permitted either sepulture or † mourning; yet it was in the power of the Magistrate to * indulge the leave of buriall: and there-

† Non solent
autem lugeri
(ut Nervius

ait) hostes, vel perduellionis damnati, nec suspendiofi, nec qui manus sibi intulerunt non ex odio vitæ, sed mala conscientia. *Dig. l. 3. tit. 2. l. Libertinum.*

* Ulpianus, l. 9. de Officio Proconsulis: Corpora eorum qui capite damnantur cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt; & id se observasse etiam Divus Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. Hodie autem eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter sepeliuntur, quam si fuerit petatum & permissum: & nonnunquam non permittitur, maxime majestatis causa damnatorum. So Paulus l. 1. Sententiarum: Corpora animadversorum quibuscumque perentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt. Obnoxios criminum digno supplicio subjectos sepulturæ tradi non vetamus, *Cod. l. 3. tit. 43. l. 11.*

fore *Pilate*, who crucified Christ onely because the *Jews* desir'd it, could not possibly deny him buriall when they requested it; he which professed to find no fault in him while he lived, could make no pretence for an accession of cruelty after his death.

Isa. 53. 9.

Now though the *Jews* had obtained their request of *Pilate*, though Christ had bin thereby certainly buried, yet had not the prediction bin fulfill'd which expressly mentioned the *rich in his death*. For as he was crucified between two thieves, so had he bin buried with them, because by the *Jews* there was appointed a publick place of buriall for all which suffered as Malefactors.

Mat. 27.

Mar. 15.

Luc. 23.

Joh. 19.

Wherefore to rescue the body of our blessed Saviour from the malicious hands of those that caus'd his crucifixion, *there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, an honourable counsellor, a good man and a just, who also himself waited for the kingdome of God, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews: this Joseph came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and besought him that he might take away the body of Jesus; and Pilate gave him leave, and commanded the body to be delivered; he came therefore and took the body of Jesus.*

ph. 3. 1.

and 19. 39, 40.

Beside *there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, a master of Israel; this Nicodemus came and brought a mixture of myrrhe and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes, with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury.* And thus was the buriall of the Son of God perform'd according to the custome of the people of God. For the understanding of which there are three things considerable: first, what was done to the body to prepare it for the grave; secondly, how the sepulchre was prepared to receive the body; thirdly, how the persons were fitted by the interring of our Saviour to fulfill the prophesy.

As for the fulfilling the custome of the *Jews* as to the preparation in respect of his body, we find the *spices* and the

linen clothes. When there came a woman having an alabaſter box of ointment of ſpikenard very precious, and ſhe brake the box and poured it on his head, Chriſt made this interpretation of that action, ſhe is come before-hand to anoint my body to the burying. When Chriſt was riſen, Mary Magdalen and the other Mary brought the ſpices which they had prepared, that they might come and anoint him. Thus was there an interpreted and an intended unction of our Saviour, but really and actually he was interred with the ſpices which Nicodemus brought. The cuſtome of wrapping in the linen clothes we ſee in Lazarus riſing from the grave; for he came forth bound hand & foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin. In the ſame manner when our Saviour was riſen, Simon Peter went into the ſepulchre, and ſaw the linen clothes lye, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by it ſelf. Thus according to the cuſtome of the Jews was the body of Chriſt bound in † ſeverall linen clothes with an aromaticall compoſition, and ſo prepared for the ſepulchre.

Mar. 14. 3, 8.

Mar. 16. 1.

Luc. 24. 1.

Joh. 11. 44.

Joh. 20. 6, 7.

† There are 4. words in the Gopſell expreſſing the linen

As clothes in which

the dead were buried, *Σινδών, ὀδόνια, κηρία, & σιδείον*. The *Σινδών* is uſed by 3. Evangelists, as what was brought by Joſeph. *Καὶ ἀπορροῦς σινδῶνα, καὶ καδῶν αὐτῶν, ἐνέλησε τῇ σινδῶνι*, Mar. 15. 46. and S. Matthew and S. Luke, *ἐνέσκηψαν αὐτὸ σινδῶνι*. *Ὀδόνια* is uſed by S. Luke and S. John; *Ἐλάβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐθήκον αὐτὸ ὀδονίοις*. Now both theſe words ſhew that the clothes were linen. *Σινδών*, tunica linea, *Gloß. Φασάγιον λινεὺν πῆτοι σινδόνιον*, Eſym. So *Ὀδόνια, λινὰ ἱμάτια*, Heſyc. This was according to the cuſtome of the Jews; amongſt whom there was a kind of law that they ſhould uſe no other grave-clothes. As therefore the Egyptians in Herodotus, *λέσαντες τὸν νεκρὸν κατελίπονται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα σινδῶν* βυστίνης; ſo the Jews. But it is farther to be obſerved, that S. John ſaith *ἐθήκον αὐτὸ ὀδονίοις*, they bound up his body with ſeverall clothes, which ſignifies it was done ſalciatim. As Herodotus in another caſe, *κηρύησι τε ἰσχυροῦς τὰ ἔλκυστα, καὶ σινδῶν* βυστίνης *τελαμῶσι κατελίποντες*. Whereas then Julius Pollux obſerves, *οἰονταὶ δὲ πῦν καὶ τελαμῶν σινδόνιται*, *lineæ ſalcia* or inſtitæ, called in the caſe of Lazarus *κηρία*. for as he is deſcribed *δεδεμμένον κηρίαις*, ſo it is ſaid of the body of Chriſt, *ἐθήκον αὐτὸ ὀδονίοις*, they bound him with linen bandages

bandages or swathes. These are the *ὀντόλια δαμά*, as the Grammarians interpret *κρίβη* τανquam *κρίβη*. So the Ancient MS. in the Library at S James's reads it, *δὲ δὲ μὲν* τὰς *χῶρας* καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὰς *κρίβας*. And so Helychius reads it, when he makes that interpretation, *Κρίβας* (leg. *Κρίβας*) *ὀντόλια* ὀντόλια *κρίβας*. What anciently *κρίβη* was, will appear by the words of Julius Pollux; Καὶ μὲν τὸς τῇ κλίνῃ ἢ τῇ σκίματι ὀντοταμένον ὡς οἶον τὰ τυλῶα, αὐτοῖα, αὐτοῖα, τὰ τὸν, *κρίβη*, the bands or cords by which the beds or couches are fastened, and upon which the beddain lies. In this sense it is to be taken in that known place of Aristophanes, in *Avisus*,

Σπάρτῳ δ' αὖ θήμην ὅγ' ὃ τῇ μῇ πάλλῃ,

Οὐδ' ἂν χαμῶνεν πένυε καὶ ἱστὶν ἔχον.

Of which Eustathius *Iliad.* β. gives us this account: Φασὶ μὲν ἂν λεγέσθαι κάρια, κάρια ἔχων· ἦτοι μὲν λεγέσθαι σαρτίνην πλέγματ'· ἐὰν δὲ γινώσκῃ κάρια, ἦτοι λεγέσθαι κλίνης. Hence the Grammarians give that interpretation of κάρια: as Etymologus, Κάρια σημαίνει τὸ χοιρίον τὸ ἀσμεῖον τὴν κλίνην, viz. in reference to that place of Aristophanes; otherwise it hath no relation to a bed, but indifferently signifieth any fascia or band. So the Scholiast of Aristophanes, Ἡ δὲ κάρια ἐστὶ τὸ ζώνης ὅν χοιρίων παριούκας ἰμάντι ἢ δισμῶσι τὰς κλίνας, not the cover of a bed, but a fascia or girdle like unto it. With such linen fasciae, swaths, and bandages, was the body of Lazarus involved. Ἐκ ποδὸς ἀρχὴ καρήνης Σφριγδαίων καταΐσιν ὄλον δέμας· οἷον κάριας, says Nonnus. And Juvenalis,

Nec mora, connexis manibus pedibusque repente

Procedit tumulo, vultum cui linea texit,

Et totum gracilis connectit fascia corpus.

Hence Basil Bishop of Seleucia makes Lazarus come out of the grave to life like an infant in swaddling-clothes. *Ἐκ τῆς ἀνενδύσεως τετραήμερον τὰ τῶν σωτῆρων περιεκοίμην* & *σύμβολα* ἡ γὼν θάνατον ἀποδυσάμενος, τὴν τὰ φάρυ σελήνην κημάζοντο, ἀλλ' ἐφύετο πῶς κελεύει ὡς ἐκ τὰ φάρυ τεχθεὶς, ἡ μὲν τὰ τέκνον ἄνθρωπον τὰ φάρυ γαῖαν. *Orat. in Publican. & Pha II.* The *κελεύει* then were *institae*, as the Vulgate Latine; *fasciis*, as Juvenecus and the Syriack translation, *ἄνθρωπον τὸν, τινὰς fasciis*. Of the same nature I conceive were the *ἰνδύματα* mentioned in our Saviour's buriall; and so S. Augustine does expresse them in reconciling the rest of the Evangelists, who mentioned onely Joseph and the sindon, with S. John, who added Nicodemus and the *ἰνδύματα*. Neque hic aliquid repugnet recte intelligentibus. Neque enim illi qui de Nicodemo tacuerunt, affirmaverunt à solo Joseph Dominum sepultum, quamvis solius commemorationem fecerint; aut quia illi una sindone à Joseph involutum dixerunt, propterea prohibuerunt intelligi & alia linthea potuisse afferri à Nicodemo & superaddi: ut verum narraret Johannes quod non uno lintheo, sed lintheis involutus sit; quamvis & propter sudarium quod capiti adhibebatur, & institas quibus totum corpus alligatum est, quia omnia de lino erant, etiamsi una sindon ibi fuit, verissime dici potuit, ligaverunt cum lintheis. De consensu *Evang. l. 3. c. 23.* These, which he calls *institae* quibus totum corpus alligatum est, were the *תכריכי המות*, involucrea mortui. Beside these, we read in the history of Lazarus, *ἡ ὥστε αὐτὸν συνδέσαντες περιεβόδοντο*, *Joh. 11. 44.* Of our Saviour, *ἡ τὸ συνδέειν ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ*. The same is rendred by

the Syriack ΝΤΙΩ, and Nonnus makes it a Syriack word, Καλινίφ πεπύκασθαι καλινίφσι κυκλάσθαι χόρσιν, Σινδαιον τόφρ ἢ πρὸ Σύρων σόμα. Whereas the word is not of a Syriack, but Latine origination, and from the Latines came to the Greek and Eastren people: Sudor and Sudare, from thence Sudarium. Vatinus reus, agente in eum Calvo, sudario candido frontem deterfit. *Quintil.* Suetonius of Nero, Plerumque prodiit in publicum ligato circa collum sudario. This was translated into their own language by the later Greeks, to signifie that which before was called ἡμυτίβιον and καψιδρότιον, as is observed by Julius Pollux Τὸ δ' ἡμυτίβιον, ἔστι μὲν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Αἰγυπτίων· εἴη δ' αὖ καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ μέσῃ Κομφιδῇ καψιδρότιον καλεῖσθαι, ὃ νῦν Σινδαιον ὀνομάζουσι. Αἰετοφάνει δὲ ἐν Πλάτῳ τοιαύτη τις ἰδέσθαι. Ἐπειτα καψιδρόν ἡμυτίβιον λαβὼν, τὰ βλεφαρὰ πεσεύησιν, where τὰ βλεφαρὰ πεσεύησιν, is the same with that in Quintilian, frontem deterfit; ἡμυτίβιον then the same with sudarium. So the Scholiast upon that place: ἡμυτίβιον ἀπὸ τοῦ Σινδαιον· ῥάκιον ἡμυτίβες, λινὴν τι οὗ ἰκμαγείον. This is the proper signification of Σινδαιον, viz. a linen cloth used to wipe off sweat: but when it was translated into the Chaldee or Syriack language, it received a more generall signification, of any cloth, or veil, or covering of linen, for any other use. As Ruth 3. 15. Bring the veil that thou hast upon thee: the Chaldee rendreth it, וְהָיָה כִּי תִבְרַח מִן הַבַּיִת וְהָיָה בְּיָדְךָ הַכֶּסֶת, and it held 6. measures of barley. So, when Moses is said to put a veil on his face, Exod. 34. 33. the Chaldee again rendreth it וְהָיָה כִּי יִשָּׂא אֶת הַכֶּסֶת וְהָיָה בְּיָדְךָ הַכֶּסֶת. So the Rabbins ordinarily use כֶּסֶת וְהָיָה בְּיָדְךָ הַכֶּסֶת the veil or covering of his head: and in that sense it is here taken, not with any relation to the Etymology, as Nonnus conceiv'd in those words, Θεμελὼν ἔχων ἰδρῶτα καλυπτομένην περσάων, as if Lazarus at come sweating out of his grave; but only to the use, as being bound about the head, and covering the face, which the Epistle of Marcialis calls sudarium mortuorum.

As for the preparation of the sepulchre to receive the body of our Saviour, the custome of the Jews was also punctually observ'd in that. Joseph of Arimathea had prepar'd a place of buriall for himself, and the manner of it is express'd. For in the place where he was crucified, Mar. 27. there was a garden, and in the garden a new sepulchre Mar. 15. wherein never man was laid, which Joseph had hewen out of the rock for his own tombe; there layd they Iesus, and roll'd a great stone to the door of the sepulchre: and so Christ was buried after the manner of the Jews, in a Vault made by the excavation of the rocky firm part of the earth, & that Vault secured from externall injury by a great massy stone rolled to the mouth or door thereof. After which

† Strabo observeth of Jerusalem, that the ground about it, ὅπως ἔστιν, was covered, for nine miles rocky underneath. It is therefore no wonder

wonder that in a garden so near Jerusalem there should be found ground which was petrosa. It is said therefore of Joseph, that *μνημεῖον ἐλατόμουν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ* of the sepulchre, that *ἢ λατομῆμενον ἐκ πέτρας*, and *λαξευτὸν*, which signifies less than that it was cut out of a rock: and Nonnus makes a particular paraphrase to that purpose of *λαξευτὸν* οὐκ ἐξ ἑνὲν γούτονι κύψῳ τύμβος ἀδωμήτοις βαθυμῆνυς ἀπὸ πέτρας Γλυπῆς ὅλος νεότακτος. Where *βαθυμῆνυς* signifies the excavation of the rock, and *γλυπῆς* the manner by which that excavation was performed, by incision or excultion. But Salmasius hath invented another way, making the tomb to be digged, and a sepulchre built by art of stone within it. And this interpretation he endeavours to prove out of the text: first, alledging that *πέτρα* signifies, in the writers of that age, a stone, not a rock; and therefore *λατομῆμενον ἐκ πέτρας* is in *ἀδω*, made of stone: otherwise the Article would have bin added, *ἐκ τῆς πέτρας*, if he meant the rock which was there. But this is soon answered; for in S. Matthew the Article is expressly added, *ἐλατόμουν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ*. S. Matthew therefore understood it of that rock which was in the garden: and the rest without question understood the same. Again he objects, that *λατομεῖν* signifies not onely lapides ex lapidibus excidere, but also polire & quadrare ad ædificandum; and *λαξεύειν* signifies the last onely. Wherefore being it is said not onely *λατομῆμενον*, which may be understood of building, but also *λαξευτὸν*, which can be understood of no other; therefore he concludes, that it was a Vault built of square stone within the ground. But there is no necessity of such a precise sense of *λαξεύειν*, which may be extended to any sense of *λατομεῖν*: and that, when it speaks of a Jewish custome, must be taken in that sense which is most congruous to their custome, and as they used the word. Now they understood the word *צלה* by *λατομεῖν*, as 1 King. 5. 15. *וְכָל צֶלֶה לַאֲדָמָה ἐν ἔργῳ*. Isa. 51. *סִבְצָה צֶלֶה לִנְיָ יִשְׂרָאֵל, ἐμβλέπετε εἰς τὴν σερᾶν πέτρας ἢν ἐλατομῶσατε*, unde excisi. As therefore Deut. 6. 11. *λάκκας λατομῆμενους ὡς ἐκ ἐλατομῶσαι*: so Isa. 22. 16. *Ὅτι ἐλατομῶσαι σπαντὶς ὧδε μνημεῖον... ἢ ἐξαφ᾽ οὐραυτῶ ἐν πέτρᾳ σκλῆρῃ*: in both places *λατομεῖν* is nothing else but *צלה*, and therefore *μνημεῖον λατομῆμενον* in the language of the Jews is to be taken in the same sense which *λάκκα* *λατομῆμενος*, that is, digged or hewn out of the ground. This cutting the sepulchre out of the rock, rather than building of it in the earth, is very materiall in the opinion of S. Jerome, who makes this observation on Matth. 27. In monumento novo quod excisum fuerat ē petra conditus est, ne si ex multis lapidibus ædificatum esset, suffossis tumuli fundamentis, ablatus furto diceretur; and gives this interpretation of the Prophet Isaiah, Quod autem in sepulchro ponendus esset, Prophetæ testimonium est dicentis, Hic habitabit in excisa spelunca petra fortissima: statimque post duos versiculos sequitur, Regem cum gloria videbitis. Another use of the same supposition is made likewise by S. Ambrose. Domini corpus tanquam per Apostolorum doctrinam infertur in vacuum & in novam requiem lapidis excisi; scilicet in pectus duritiæ gentilis quodam doctrinæ opere excisum Christus infertur, rude scilicet ac novum, & nullo antea ingressu timoris Dei pervium. 11 Matth. Can. 33. Thus was the Sepulchre prepared for the body: and when Joseph had laid it there, *περὶ σκυῶσι λίθον μέγαν πρὸς τὴν θύραν*, he rolled a great stone to the door, the last part of that solemnity. For this great stone was said to be rolled

led, by reason of the bignesse, as being not portable, (from whence arose the womens doubt, Mar. 16. 3. Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?) and that very properly, for it had it's name from that rolling, being called constantly by the Jews גלגל, or גלגל, from גלגל volvere. שמואל בן נחמיה, Obadiah de Bartenora.

which stone was once rolled thither, the whole funerall action was perform'd, and the sepulture completed: so that it was not lawfull by the custome of the *Jews* any more to open the sepulchre, or disturbe the interred body.

Thirdly, two eminent persons did concur unto the buriall of our Saviour, a † Ruler and a Counsellour, men of those orders among the *Jews* as were of greatest authority with the people; *Ioseph* of *Arimathea*, rich and honourable, and yet inferiour to *Nicodemus*, one of the great Council of the *Sanhedrim*: these two, though feartull

* This bath bin observed by the Jews themselves, אסור

לפתוח הקבר אחר שנסתם הגלגל:

It is prohibited for any man to open the sepul-

† So they are styled

one after it is shut with the rolled stone.

in the Scriptures, *Ioseph* βαλυστης, & *Nicodemus* ἀρχων: & these two powers ruled all then at Jerusalem under the Romans. As appeared when Agrippa prevented a warre by the sudden raising of a Tax. Εἰς τὰς καίμας οἱ τοὶ ἀρχοντες καὶ οἱ βαλυσταὶ μακιδόντες φόβος Γαβριέλον. *Ioseph.* l. 2. c. 29.

while he lived, to acknowledge him, are brought by the hand of providence to interre him; that so the prediction might be fulfilled which was delivered by *Isaiah*, to this purpose. The counsell of his enemies, the designe of the *Jews*, made his grave with the wicked, that he might be buried with them which were crucified with him: but because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth, because he was no way guilty of those crimes for which they justly suffered; that there might be a difference after their death, though there appeared little distinction in it; the counsell of his Father, the design of Heaven, put him with the rich in his death, and caus'd a Counsellour and a Ruler of the *Jews* to bury him.

The necessity of this part of the Article appeareth, first, in that it gives a testimony and assurance of the truth, both

Mar. 15. 44. 45.

of Christs death preceding, and of his resurrection following. Men are not put into the earth before they dye: *Pilate* was very inquisitive, whether our Saviour *had bin any while dead*, & was fully satisfied by the Centurion, before he would *give the body to Ioseph* to be interred. Men cannot be said to rise who never dyed, nor can there be a true Resurrection, where there hath not bin a true dissolution. That therefore we might believe Christ truly rose from the dead, we must be first assured that he dyed; and a greater assurance of his death then this we cannot have, that his body was deliver'd by his enemies from the cross, and laid by his disciples in the grave.

Coloss. 2. 12.

Rom. 6. 4.

† Quicquid
gestum est in
cruce Christi,
in sepultura,
in resurrectione.

ne tertio die, in ascensione in cœlum, & in sede ad dextram Patris, ita gestum est, ut his rebus non mystice tantum dictis, sed etiam gestis, configuraretur vita Christiana quæ hic geritur. Nam propter ejus crucem dictum est, *Qui autem in Christo sunt, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum vitiis & concupiscentiis*; propter sepulturam, *Consepulti enim sumus cum Christo per baptismum in mortem*; propter resurrectionem, *Ut quemadmodum Christus resurrexit à mortuis per gloriam Patris, ita & nos in novitate vite ambulemus*; propter ascensionem in cœlum, sedemque ad dextram Patris, *Si autem resurrexistis cum Christo, quæ sursum sunt querite, ubi Christus est ad dextram Dei sedens*. S. August. *Enchirid.* ad Laur.

Act. 5. 6.

Thirdly, it was most convenient that those pious solemnities should be performed on the body of our Saviour, that his disciples might for ever learn what honour was fit to be receiv'd and given at their funeralls. When *Ananias* dyed, though for his sin, yet they *wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him*. When *Stephen* was

was stoned, devout men carried him to his buriall, and *Ac.* 8. 2.
made great lamentation over him: and when *Dorcas* dy-
ed, they washed her, and laid her in an upper chamber. So
carefull were the Primitive Christians of the rites of buri- 9-37.
all. Before, and at our Saviours time, the *Greeks* did
much, and *Romans* more, use the burning of the bodies of
the dead, and reserved onely their ashes in their urnes: but
when Christianity began to encrease, the funerall flames
did cease, and after a few † Emperours had received bap-
tisme, there was not a body burnt in all the *Roman*
Empire. For the first Christians wholly abtained

† This appeareth
by Macrobius,
who lived in the
time of Theo-
dorus junior,

and testifieth thus much: *Licet urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro saculo nul-
lus sit, lectio tamen docet, eo tempore quo igni dari honor mortuis habebatur, &c.*
L. 7. c. 7. That this was done by the Christians is certain, because the Heathens an-
ciently did object it to the Christians; Inde, videlicet & execrantur rogos, & damnant
ignium sepulturas. And the answer given to this objection was, Nec, ut creditis,
ullum damnum sepulturæ timemus, sed veterem & meliorem consuetudinem
humandi frequentamus. *Minut. Felix* in *Octavio*. And *Tertul.* Et hoc etiam in
opinione quorundam est; propterea nec ignibus funerandum aunt, parentes
superfluo animæ. Alia est autem ratio pietatis istius, non reliquiis animæ adula-
trix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aversatrix, quod & ipsum homo non
uniquè mereatur pœnali exitu impendi. *De Anima, cap. 51.* At ego magis ridebo
vulgus tunc quoque, cum ipsos defunctos atrocissime exurit, quos postmodum gu-
lissime nutrit, iisdem ignibus & promerens & offendens. O pietatem de cru-
delitate ludentem! sacrificat, an insultat, cum crematis cremat? *Idem de Resurr.*
curg. cap. 1.

from consuming of the dead bodies with fire, and follow-
ed the example of our Saviours funerall: * making use of
precious ointments for the dead, which they refused while
they lived, and spending the spices of *Arabia* in their
graves. The decoration of the persons which interred
Christ, and the commemoration of their vertues, and the e-
verlasting commendation of her who brake the box of pre-
cious

* The heathens
objected it to
the Primitive
Christians;
Reservatis un-
guenta funeri-
bus. *Minutius*
Felix. And
Tertullian

confesseth it: Thura plane non emimus. Si *Arabie* quærantur, sciant *Sabæi* pluri-
& cariores suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari, quam Diis fumigandis.
Apolog. c. 42. And speaking of spices lib. de *Idololat.* Etiam hominibus ad pigmen-

ta medicinalia; nobis quoque insuper ad solatia sepulturæ usui sunt. So Clemens Alexand. *Μυεζόνται γὰρ οἱ νεκροί.* And again, *Αἱ γὰρ παύματαί χειρὸς τῶν μύρων κηδεύει, ὡς συμβιάσας ἀποπνεύσιν.* *Pedag. l. 2. c. 8.*

† Ipse Dominus die tertio resurrecturus religiosæ mulieris bonum opus prædicat, prædicandumque commendat, quod unguentum pretiosum super membra ejus

effuderit, atque hoc ad eum sepeliendum fecerit. Et laudabiliter commemorantur in Evangelio, qui corpus ejus de cruce acceptam diligenter atque honorifice tegendum sepeliendumque curarunt. Verum istæ autoritates non hoc admonent, quod insit ullus cadaveribus sensus: sed ad Dei providentiam, cui placent etiam talia pietatis officia, corpora queque mortuorum pertinere significant, propter fidem resurrectionis astruendam. S. August. *de Civitate Dei, l. 1. c. 13.*

Nec ideo tamen contemnenda & abjicienda sunt corpora defunctorum, maximeque justorum atque fidelium, quibus tanquam organis & vasis ad omnia bona opera Sanctus usus est Spiritus. Si enim paterna vestis & annulus, ac si quid hujusmodi tanto charius est posteris, quanto erga parentes major exitit affectus, nullo modo ipsa spernenda sunt corpora, quæ utique multo familiarius atque conjunctius quam quælibet indumenta gestamus. Hæc enim non ad ornamentum vel adjutorium quod adhibetur extrinsecus, sed ad ipsam naturam hominis pertinent. S. Aug. *de Civitate Dei, l. 1. c. 13.* Ταῦτα πλεονεξία ὁ ἱεράρχης ἀποτίθησιν ἐν οἴκῳ πρὶν τὸ σῶμα μετὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ὁμοταγῶν ἱερῶν σωματίων. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι τὴν φιλοφιλίαν ζῶντων ὁ κεκοιμημένος ἐβίω, τίμιον ἔσται μετὰ τῶν ὁσίων ψυχῶν καὶ τῶν σωμάτων αὐτῶν σῶμα κατὰ τὸν ἱερεὺς ἱδρωτάς, ἐνθεν ἡ θεία δακρυοσπινὴ μετὰ τῶν σφετέρων σωματίων αὐτῶν δωρεῖται τὰς ἀμειβάσας λήξεις, οἱ δὲ ὁμοπορεύονται καὶ συμμετόχῳ τῶν ὁσίων ἢ τῶν ἀντιτίκας ζωῆς. Dionys. *Ecclesiast. Hierarch. c. 7.*

* This was observed by Julian the Apostate, who writing to an Idolatrous

High priest, puts him in mind of those things by which he thought the Christians gained upon the world, and recommends them to the practice of the Heathen Priests. Of this

custom of the Primitive Christians was so acceptable unto God, that by his providence it proved most * effectual in the conversion of the Heathens, and propagation of the Gospel.

This

reasons three: *The gravity of their carriage, their kindnesse to strangers, and their care for the buriall of the dead.* Τὸ αὐτὸ ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔμαθον ταῦτα ἀρετῶν, ἢ ἀποβλέποντες ἐν μέλλουσιν τὴν ἀδοξίαν (so he calls Christianity, because they rejected all the *Heavenly Gods*) (σωσύνεσιν, ἢ ἐπὶ τοῦ ζήνους φιλοφρονεία, καὶ ἢ ἐπὶ τὰς ταφὰς τῶν νεκρῶν περὶ μέλει, καὶ ἡ πεπλοσμένη συμνότης καὶ τὸν βίον; ὃν ἔχουσιν οἰομαι ἔχειν παρ' ἡμῶν) ὁμολογῶς ὁμολογῶμεν. *Epist. 49. ad Arsacium.* And as Julian *rejoiced* the care of buriall as a great encouragement to the Heathens to turn Christians, so Gregory Nazianzen did observe the same to the great dishonour of the Apostles, comparing his Funerall with his Predecessors. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ (that is Constantine) παροργισμένος παρ' ἡμῶν εὐρηματίας καὶ πεμπτής, καὶ τέτοις ὅ τοις ἡμεῖς σκεπτόμεθα, ὅσους παννύχους καὶ ἀφύπνους, αἷς Χριστιανοὶ τιμᾶν μετὰ τὴν ἐκταφὴν νομίζουσιν· καὶ γινώσκοντες μετὰ πάσης ἡ ἀνομιᾶς τὸ σῶμα. But Julian, μῆ μοι γελοῖον ἦρον αὐτὸν, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τ' οὐλῆς αἶσιν ἐπομνήστο.... ἔως ἡ Ταρσύν αὐτὸν ἐκταφίσαντες... ἔνθα ὅτε τέμενος ἀτίμω, καὶ τάφος ἔξωτός καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἔδωκε διατὸς εὐπρεπῶν ὀφείσει. *Selincut. 2.*

Thus I believe the onely-begotten and eternall Son of God, for the confirmation of the truth of his death already past, and the verity of his resurrection from the dead suddenly to follow, had his body, according to the custome of the Jews, prepared for a funerall, bound up with linen clothes, and laid in spices; and after that accustomed preparation, deposited in a Sepulchre hewn out of a rock, in which never man was laid before, and by the rolling of a stone unto the door thereof, entombed there. Thus I believe that Christ *was buried*.

ARTICLE V.

He descended into hell: the third day he rose again from the dead.

THE former part of this Article, of the *Descent into Hell*, hath not bin so † anciently in the Creed, or so † *First, it is to be observed, that the Descent into Hell was* universally, as the rest. The first place we find it used in, into Hell was in the ancient Creeds or Rules of Faith. Some tell us that it was not in the Confession of Ignatius, *Epist. ad Magnes.* But indeed there is no Confession of Faith in that *Epistle*; for what is read there, was the first in our of Clemens his Constitutions. In the

the like manner, in vain is it objected, that it was omitted by Polycarp, Clement Romanus, and Justin Martyr, because they have not pretended any Rule of Faith, or Creed of their times. But that which is material in this cause, it is not to be found in the Rules of Faith delivered by Irenæus, lib. 1. cap. 2. by Origen, lib. 1. cap. 2. in procem. or by Tertullian adv. Praxeam, cap. 2. de Virg. veland. cap. 1. de Prescript. adv. Hæret. c. 13. It is not expressed in those Creeds which were made by the Councils as larger explications of the Apostles Creed: not in the Nicene, or Constantinopolitan; not in that of Ephesus or Chalcedon; not in those Confessions made at Sardica, Antioch, Seleucia, Sirmium, &c. It is not mentioned in several Confessions of Faith delivered by particular persons: not in that of Eusebius Cæsariensis presented to the Council of Nice, Theodoret. l. 1. c. 2. not in that of Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra delivered to Pope Julius, Epiphani. Hæret. 72. not in that of Arius and Euzoius presented to Constantine, Socrat. l. 1. c. 19. not in that of Acacius Bishop of Cæsarea delivered into the Synod of Seleucia, Socrat. l. 2. c. 40. not in that of Eustathius, Theophilus and Silvanus, sent to Liberius, Socrat. l. 4. c. 12. There is no mention of it in the Creed of S. Basil, Tract. de Fide in Asceticis: in the Creed of Epiphanius, in Ancorato. 120. Gelasius, Damasus, Macarius, &c. It is not in the Creed expounded by S. Cyril, (though some have produced that Creed to prove it;) it is not in the Creed expounded by S. Augustine, de Fide & Symbolo; not in that De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, attributed to S. Augustine; nor in that which is expounded by Maximus Taurinensis, nor that so often interpreted by Petrus Chrysologus; nor in that of the Church of Antioch delivered by Cassianus, de Incarn. l. 6. neither is it to be seen in the MSS. Creeds set forth by the learned Archbishop of Armagh. Indeed it is affirmed by Rufinus, that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Orientall Creeds: sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additum, descendit ad inferna; sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo. Ruff. in Expofit. Symboli. It is certain therefore, (as can we dispute it by any acknowledged evidence of antiquity) that the Article of the descent into hell was not in the Roman, or any of the Orientall Creeds.

400 years after Christ, in. was the Church of *Aquileia*; and the time we are sure it was used in the Creed of that Church was lesse then 400. years after Christ. After that it came into the *Roman* Creed, and † others, and hath bin acknowledged as a part of the Apostles Creed ever since.

Indeed
appeareth, not onely because we find it there of late, but because we find it often in the Latine Church many ages since. As in that produced by Etherius against Elipandus in the year 785. in the 115 Sermon de Tempore falsely ascribed to S. Augustine, where it is attributed to S. Thomas the Apostle. In the Exposition of the Creed falsely ascribed to S. Chrysostome.

† A. in the Creed ascribed to Athanasius, which though we cannot say was his, yet we know was extant about the year 600. by the Epistle of Isidorus Hispalensis ad Claudium Ducem. It was

is inserted into the Creed of the Council of Ariminum, Sac. 4. 2. c. 37. and of the fourth Council of Toledo held in the year 633. and of the sixteenth Council of the same Toledo held in the year 693.

Indeed the *Descent into the Hell* hath * alwayes bin accepted, but with a various exposition: and the Church of England at the Reformation, as it received the three Creeds, in two of which this Article is contained, so did it also make this one of the Articles of Religion, to which all who are admitted to any Benefice or received into holy Orders are obliged to subscribe. And at the first reception it was propounded with a certain Explication, and thus delivered in the fourth year of King Edward the sixth, with reference to an expresse place of Scripture interpreted of this *Descent*. *That the body of Christ lay in the grave until his Resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detain'd in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in S. Peter re- sists.* So likewise after the same manner in the Creed set forth in Meeter after the manner of a Psalm, and still remaining at the end of the Psalms, the same exposition is delivered in this stasse,

*And so he dyed in the flesh,
But quickned in the spirit;
His body then was buried,
As is our use and right.*

*His spirit did after this descend
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darknesse were
The true light of their hearts.*

But in the Synod ten yeares after, in the dayes of Queen Elizabeth, the Articles, which continue still in force, deliver the same *Descent*, but without any the least expli- cation, or reference to any particular place of Scripture,

M m m

in

* Quis nisi in-
fidelis negave-
rit fuisse apud
infernus Chri-
stum? S. Aug.
Ep. 99.

1 Pet. 3. 19.
Nam Corpus
usque ad Re-
surrectionem
in sepulchro
jacuit; Spiritus
ab illo emis-
sus cum spiri-
tibus qui in
Carcere sive in
Inferno detine-
bantur fuit;
illisque prædi-
cavit, ut testa-
tur Petri locus,
Ecce. Articuli
an. 1552.

Article 3.
1562.

in these words. *As Christ dyed for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into Hell.* Wherefore being our Church hath not now imposed that interpretation of S. Peter's words, which before it intimated; being it hath not delivered that as the onely place of Scripture to found the *Descent into hell* upon; being it hath alledged no other place to ground it, and delivered no other explication to expound it; we may with the greater liberty passe on to find out the true meaning of this Article, and to give our particular judgement in it, so far as a matter of so much obscurity and variety will permit.

First then, it is to be observed, that as this Article was first in the *Aquileian Creed*, so it was delivered there, not in the expresse and formall terme of *Hell*, but in such a word as may be capable of a greater latitude, *Descendit in inferna*: which words as they were continued in other Creeds, so did they find a double interpretation in the *Greeks*, some translating *inferna*, *hell*, others the * *lower parts*; the first with relation to S. Peter, *thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*; the second referring to S. Paul, *he descended into the lower parts of the earth*.

† Descendit in inferna, or ad inferna, is the generall writing in the Ancient Mss. as the learned

Archbishop testifieth of those in the Benedictine and Cottonian Libraries: we see the same likewise in that of Elipandus, *Descendit ad inferna*. * So the Ancient Mss. in Bennet Colledge Library, *καταδύντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα* and the Confession made at Sirmium, *εἰς τὰ κατωχθόνια καταδύντα*. Since that it is, *Descendit ad inferos*, and *καταδύντα εἰς ᾧδus*, or *Descendit ad infernum*, as Venantius Fortunatus. For *τὰ κατώτατα* is a fit interpretation, if we take *inferna* according to the Vulgar Etymology, as S. Augustine, *Inferi eo quod infra sint Latine appellantur*, *De Gen. ad lit. l. 12. c. 34.* Or as Nonius Marcellus, *Inferum ab imo dictum, unde inferi quibus inferius nihil.* Again, *Inferna* may well be translated *ᾧδus*, if it be taken according to the true Origination, which is from the Greek *ἔρεος*, with the Æolick dizeamma, from which Dialect most of the Latine languages came. *EvFegoi*, *Inferi*. Now *ἔρεος* according to the Greek composition is nothing else but *κατοχθόνιοι*. Erym. *Ἐρεος, οἱ νεκροί, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἔρα καίᾳ, ὅτι ἐν τῇ γῇ.* and Suid. *Ἐρεος, νεκροί, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἔρα καίᾳ.* *Era* is anciently the earth, from whence *εραζε*, *χαλαζε*, to the earth; *ἔρεος* then are in the earth, as they supposed the Manes or Spirits of the dead to be; from whence Homer *Ilad. o. Aἰδus ἐρεγον ἀνέων*, of Pluto; and in imitation of him Æschylus in *Peris*, *ἔρεος*.

Second-

* So the

the

as

De

see

we

the

me

at

Wh

the

Sir

re,

shou

79

ἡ ψυχή, βασιλεὺς τ' ἐν ἑσέων, Πέμψατ' ἐνερθεύ ψυχὰς εἰς οὐδ'. And as *Manes* are the *soules* of the dead in the earth, so are *Inferi* in the first acception, that is *Manes*. *Pomponius Mela*, *Augilæ manes tantum Deos putant*; which *Pliny* deliv-
ers thus, *Augilæ inferos tantum colunt*; and *Solinus*, *Augilæ vero solos colunt inferos*. *Inferi* were then first *Evæge*, the *soules* of men in the earth: and as *Manes* and one's taken for the *soules* below, but also for the place, as in the Poet,

----- *Manesque profundi,*

and, *Hæc Manes veniat mihi fama sub imos;*

so *Inferi* is most frequently used for the place under ground, where the *soules* depart; and the *inferna* must then be those regions in which they take up their habita-
tions; and so *Descendit ad inferna*, κατήλθεν εἰς ᾗδου, and *Descendit ad Inferos* are the same. a *Act.* b *Ephes.* 4. 9.

Secondly, I observe that in the *Aquileian Creed*, where this Article was first express'd, there was no men-
tion of Christ's buriall; but the words of their Confession ran thus, *† crucified under Pontius Pilate, he de-*
scended in inferna. From whence there is no question but the obliervation of *Ruffinus*, who first expounded it, was
most true, that though the *Roman* and *Oriental Creeds* had not their words, yet they had the sense of them in
the word *buried*. It appeareth therefore that the first in-
tention of putting these words in the Creed was onely to
expresse the buriall of our Saviour, or the descent of his
body into the grave. But although they were first put in
the *Aquileian Creed* to signifie the buriall of Christ, and
those which had onely the buriall in their Creed did confess
as much as those which without the buriall did expresse the
Descent; yet since the *Roman Creed* hath added the de-
scend unto the *buriall*, and express'd that descent by
words signifying more properly *hell*, it cannot be imagin'd
that the Creed, as now it stands, should signifie onely

† So are the words cited in *Ruffinus*, *Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in inferna*. And his Observation upon them is this, *Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad inferna: sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiæ habetur hic the Sermo; vis ta-*

men verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod sepultus est. *Expos. Symb.* The same may
also be observed in the *Athanasian Creed*, which has the Descent but not the sepulture;
Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from
the dead. Nor is this onely observable in these two, but also in the Creed made at
Sumium, and produced at *Ariminum*, in which the words run thus, σωγωδόντα,
καὶ κατέβητα, καὶ ἀνέβητα, καὶ εἰς τὰ κατὰ ᾗδου κατέβητα. were
though the Descent be express'd, and the Buriall be not mentioned, yet it is most

certain, those men which made it (Hereticks indeed, but not in this) did understand his buriall by that descent; and that appears by addition of the following words, *ἡ γὰρ κατὰ χάριν κατὰ δύναμιν, καὶ τὰ ἐκείνη ἐκνομήσθησαν, ὡς ποιεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ.* For he did not dispose and order things below by his body in the grave, nor could the keepers of the gates of Hell be affrighted with any sight of his corps lying in the sepulchre.

the buriall of Christ by his descent into hell. But rather, being the Ancient Church did certainly believe that Christ did some other way descend, beside his buriall; being *Ruffinus* himself, though he interpreted those words of the buriall onely, yet in the relation of what was done at our Saviours death, makes mention of his descent into Hell, beside and distinct from his sepulture; being those who in after ages added it to the buriall did actually believe that the soul of Christ descended; it followeth that for the Exposition of the Creed it is most necessary to declare in what that Descent consisteth.

Thirdly, I observe again, that whatsoever is delivered in the Creed we therefore believe because it is contained in the Scriptures, and consequently must so believe it as it is contained there; whence all this *Exposition* of the whole is nothing else but an illustration and proof of every particular part of the Creed by such Scriptures as deliver the same, according to the true interpretation of them, and the generall consent of the Church of God. Now these words, as they lye in the Creed, *he descended into Hell*, are no where formally and expressly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find any one place in which the Holy Ghost hath said in expresse and plain terms that Christ as he dyed and was buried, so *he descended into hell*. Wherefore being these words of the Creed are not formally express'd in the Scripture, our enquiry must be in what Scriptures they are contained virtually, that is, where the Holy Ghost doth deliver the same doctrine, in what words soever, which is contained and to be understood in this expression, *He descended into hell*.

Now severall places of Scripture have bin produced by the Ancients as delivering this truth, of which some without question prove it not: but three there are which have bin alwayes thought of greatest validity to confirm this Article. First, that of S. Paul to the Ephesians seems to come very near the words themselves, and to expresse the same almost in † terms. Now that he ascended what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the

Ephes. 4. 9.

† For the first
expression which
we find in Ruf-

inus, Descendit in inferna, comes most neer to this quotation, especially if we take the ancient Greek Translation of it, κατηγόμην εἰς τὰ κατώτατα. For if we consider that κατώτατα may well have the signification of the superlative, especially being the LXX bath so translated Psal. 63. 9. εἰς ταχέως εἰς τὰ κατώτατα ἔζησεν and Psal. 139. 15. ὅτι ἡ ὑδραὶς μου ἐν τοῖς κατώτατοις ἔζησεν what can be nearer then the sense, κατηγόμην εἰς τὰ κατώτατα, ἀνικαταβὰς εἰς τὰ κατώτατα; or these two, κατηγόμην εἰς τὰ κατωχόμην, and, καταβὰς εἰς τὰ κατώτατα μὴν ἔζησεν

earth? This many of the ancient * Fathers understood of the Descent into hell, as placed in the lowest parts of the Earth: and this exposition must be confess'd so probable, that there can be no argument to disprove it. Those lower parts of the earth may signifie hell, and Christs descending thither may be, that his soul went to that place

* This appears by
their quotation of this
place to prove
or expresse the
Descent into
Hell, as Irenaeus
does, l. 5.

c. 26. Origen

Nom. 35. in Marth. Athanasius Epist. ad Epictetum. Hilarius in Psal. 67. 5. Jerome upon the same, Inferiora autem terrae infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit. So also the Commentary attributed to S. Ambrose. & S. Hilary. Si itaque hæc omnia Christus unus est neque alius est Christus mortuus, alius sepultus aut alius descendens ad inferna, & alius ascendens in coelo, secundum illud Apostoli, Ascendit autem quid est, &c. De Trinit. l. 10.

when his body was carried to the grave. But that it was actually so, or that the Apostle intended so much in those words, the place it self will not manifest. For we cannot be assured that the descent of Christ, which S. Paul speaketh of, was performed after his death; or if it were, we cannot be assured that the lower parts of the earth did signifie

Joh. 3. 13.

Joh. 8. 32.

Psal. 119. 15.

Psal. 63. 9.

Job 1. 21.

hell, or the place where the souls of men were tormented after the separation from their bodies. For as it is written; *No man ascendeth to heaven, but he that descended from heaven*, to this may signifie so much, and no more, In that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first? And for the lower parts of the earth, they may possibly signifie no more then the place beneath; as when our Saviour said, *Ye are from beneath, I am from above: ye are of this world, I am not of this world*: or as God spake by the Prophet, *I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signes in the earth beneath*. Nay they may well referre to his Incarnation, according to that of David, *My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, & curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth*: or to his Buriall, according to that of the same Prophet, *Those that seek my soul to destroy it, shall go into the lower parts of the earth*; and these two references have a great similitude, according to that of Job, *Naked came I out of my mothers womb, and naked shall I return thither*.

The next place of Scripture brought to confirm the Descent, is not so near in words, but thought to signifie the end of that Descent, and that part of his humanity by which he descended. For Christ, saith S. Peter, *was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison*: where the Spirit seems to be the soul of Christ; and the spirits in prison, the souls of them that were in hell, or in some place at least separated from the joyes of heaven: whither because we never read our Saviour went at any other time, we may conceive he went in spirit then when his soul departed from his body on the crosse. This did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the Descent, and the ancient † Fathers did apply the same in the like

† As Irenæus
l. 4. c. 45: Clemens Alex.
Stromat. l. 6.
Orig. Hom. 35.
in Matth. S. An-
thanas. l. de In-
carn. Epiphani.
Hæres. 77.

S. Cyril de recta fide ad Theodosium, l. 12. in Johannem. Orat. Pasch. & alibi sapient.
Author Comment, Ambros. ascript. ad Rom. 10. R. ff. in Explic. Symb.

manner to the proof of this Article. But yet those words of S. Peter have no such power of probation; except we were certain that the *spirit* there spoken of were the soul of Christ, and that the time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrection. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they † staggered S. Augustine, and caused him at last to think that these words of S. Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christs descending into Hell. But indeed the Spirit by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but that Spirit by which he was quickened; as appeareth by the coherence of the words, *being put to death in the flesh, but quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison*. Now that Spirit by which Christ was quickened, is * that by which he was raised from the dead, that is the power of his divinity; as S. Paul expresseth it, *a Though he was crucified through weaknesse, yet he liveth by the power of God*: in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the dayes of Noah, as we have .∴ already shewn.

† For in his Answer to Euodius, Epist. 99. He thus begins, Quæstio quam mihi proposuisti ex Epistola Apostoli Petri, solet nos, ut relate e non arbitror, vehementissime commovere, quomodo illa verba accipienda sint tanquam de inferis dicta. Replico

ego tibi eandem quæstionem, ut sive ipse potueris, sive aliquem qui possit invenire, auferas de illa atque finias dubitationem meam. Then setting down in order all these difficulties which occur'd at that time in that Exposition of the Descent into hell, He concludes with an Exposition of another nature. Considera tamen, ne forte totum illud quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad Inferos non pertineat, sed ad illa potius tempora quorum formam ad hæc tempora transtulit.

a 2 Cor. 13. 4.

* Quid est enim quod vivificatus est Spiritu, nisi quod eadem caro qua sola fuerat mortificatus, vivificante Spiritu resurrexit? Nam quod fuerat anima mortificatus Iesus, hoc est, eo Spiritu qui hominis est, quis audeat dicere? cum mors animæ nō sit nisi peccatum, à quo ille omnino immunis fuit cum pro nobis carne mortificaretur. S. Aug. Epist. 99. & ibid. Certe anima Christi non solum immortalis secundum cæterarum naturam, sed etiam nullo mortificata peccato vel damnatione punita est; quibus duabus causis mors animæ intelligi potest, & ideo non secundum ipsam dici potuit Christus vivificatus Spiritu. In ea re quippe vivificatus est in qua fuerat mortificatus. Ergo de ea dictum est: ipsa enim revixit anima redeunte, quia ipsa erat mortua anima recedente. Mortificatus ergo carne dictus est, quia secundum solam carnem mortuus est: vivificatus autem Spiritu, quia

quia illo spiritu operante, in quo ad quos (eg. eos) veniebat & predicabat etiam ipsa caro vivificata surrexit, in qua modo ad homines venit. . . .
223, 224.

The third but principall Text is that of *David*: applied by *S. Peter*. For *David* speaketh concerning him, I fore-saw the Lord alwayes before my face, for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce and my tongue was glad: moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. Thus the Apostle repeated the words of the Psalmist, and then applied them. He being a Prophet, and seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell: neither his flesh did see corruption. Now from this place the Article is clearly and infallibly deduced thus; If the soul of Christ were not left in hell at his resurrection, then his soul was in hell before his resurrection: But it was not there before his death; therefore upon or after his death, and before his Resurrection, the soul of Christ descended into hell, and consequently the Creed doth truly deliver, that Christ being crucified, was dead, buried, and descended into hell. For as his flesh did not see corruption by vertue of that promise and propheticall expression, and yet it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it rested in hope untill his resurrection; so his soul which was not left in hell, by vertue of the like promise or prediction, was in that hell, where it was not left, untill the time that it was to be united to the body for the performing of the resurrection. We must therefore confesse from hence that the soul of Christ was in hell; and no Christian can deny it, saith *S. Augustine*, it is clearly delivered in this Prophecie of the Psalmist, and application of the Apostle.

† Dominum quidem carne mortificatum venisse in infernum satis constat. Neque enim contradici potest vel prophetiae quae dixit, Quoniam non dereliquit animam meam in Inferno (Quod ne aliter quisquam sapere auderet, in

The

hæ Apostolorum idem Petrus exponit) vel ejusdem Petri illis verbis quibus eum affecit soluisse inferni dolores, in quibus impossibile erat eum teneri. Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum ? *Epist. 99.*

The onely Question then remains, not of the truth of the Proposition, but the sense and meaning of it. It is most certain that Christ descended into Hell, and as infallibly true as any other Article of the Creed; but what that Hell was, and how he descended thither, being once question'd is not easily determined. Different opinions there have bin of old, and of late more different still, which I shall here examine after that manner which our subject will admit. Our present design is an Exposition of the Creed as now it stands, and our endeavour is to expound it according to the Scriptures in which it is contained. I must therefore look for such an explication as may consist with the other parts of the Creed, and may withall be conformable unto that Scripture upon which the truth of the Article doth rely: And consequently, whatsoever Interpretation is either not true in it self, or not consistent with the body of the Creed, or not conformable to the doctrine of the Apostle in this particular, the Expounder of that Creed by the doctrine of the Apostle must reject.

First then, we shall consider the opinion of *Durandus*; who, as often, so in this is singular. He supposeth this descent to belong † unto the soul, and the name of Hell to signifie the place where the souls of dead men were in custody: But he maketh a metaphor in the word *descended*, as not signifying any locall motion, nor inferring any reall presence of the soul of Christ in the place where the soules of dead men were; but onely including a virtual motion, and inferring an efficacious presence, by which descent the effects of the death of Christ were wrought upon the soules in Hell: and because the merit of Christs death did principally depend upon the act of his soul, therefore the effect of his death is attributed to his soul as the

† Cum Articulus sit, Christum ad Inferos descendisse, & non possit intelligi ratione Divinitatis, secundum quæ est ubique; nec ratione corporis, secundum quod fuit in sepulchro; restat quod intelligatur ratione animæ: quo supposito, videndum est qualiter anima Christi descendit ad infernum, *Durand. l. 3. dist. 22. q. 3.*

utroque causaliter ad merendum, ad nos suoipsius merito liberandos, *Parkervus de Descensu, l. 3. §. 48. & statim §. 49.* Descendisse namque servatorem, modo supra memorato, ad Haden mortis gehennalis innumeris pater argumentis.

the same for them; even all the torments which we should have felt, and the damned shall.

This Interpretation is either taken in the strict sense of the words, or in a latitude of expression; but in neither to be admitted as the Exposition of this Article. Not if it be taken in a strict, rigorous, proper, and formall sense; for in that acception it is not true. It must not, it cannot be admitted, that Christ did suffer all those torments which the damned suffer, and therefore it is not, it cannot be true, that by suffering them he descended into Hell. There is a worm that never dyeth, which could not lodge within his breast, that is, a remorse of conscience seated in the soul for what that soul hath done: but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who though he took upon himself the finnes of those which otherwise had bin damned, yet that act of his was a most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the object of remorse. The grief and horreur in the soul of Christ, which we have expressed in the explication of his sufferings antecedent to his crucifixion; had reference to the finnes and punishment of men, to the justice and wrath of God, but clearly of a nature different from the sting of conscience in the soules condemned to eternall flames. Again, an essentiall part of the torments of Hell, is a present and constant sense of the everlasting displeasure of God, and an impossibility of obtaining favour and avoiding pain; an absolute and compleat despair of any better condition, or the least relaxation. But Christ we know had never any such resentment, who looked upon the reward which was before him, even upon the crosse, and offered up himself a sweet smelling sacrifice; which could never be efficacious, except offered in faith. If we should imagine any

damned soul to have received an expresse promise of God; that after 1000 years he would release him from those torments and make him everlastingly happy, and to have a true faith in that promise, and a firm hope of receiving eternall life; we could not say that man was in the same condition with the rest of the damned, or that he felt all that Hell which they were sensible of, or all that pain which was due unto his sinnes: because hope and confidence & relying upon God would not onely mitigate all other pains, but wholly take away the bitter anguish of despair. Christ then, who knew the beginning, continuance, and conclusion of his sufferings, who understood the determinate minute of his own death and resurrection, who had made a Covenant with his Father for all the degrees of his passion, and was fully assured that he could suffer no more then he had freely and deliberately undertaken, and should continue no longer in his passion then he had himself determined; he who by those torments was assured to overcome all the powers of Hell, cannot possibly be said to have bin in the same condition with the damned, and strictly and properly to have endured the pains of Hell.

Again, if we take the torments of Hell in a Metaphoricall sense, for those terrours and horrors of soul which our Saviour felt, which may therefore be called infernall torments, because they are of greater extremity then any other tortures of this life, and because they were accompanied with a sense of the wrath of God against the unrighteousnesse of men; yet this cannot be an Interpretation of the Descent into Hell, as it is an Article of the Creed, and as that Article is grounded upon the Scriptures. For all those pains which our Saviour felt (whether, as they pretend, properly infernall, or metaphorically such) were antecedent to his death; part of them in the garden, part on the Crosse; but all before he commended his spirit into the hands of his Father, and gave up the Ghost. Whereas it is sufficiently evident, that the Descent into hell, as it stands

now in the Creed, signifieth something commenced after his death, contra. distinguish'd to his buriall; and as it is considered in the Apostles explication, is clearly to be understood of that which immediately preceded his resurrection; and that also grounded upon a confidence totally repugnant to infernall pains. For it is thus particularly express'd, *I foresaw the Lord alwayes before my face; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoyce; and my tongue was glad. Moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell:* where the faith, hope, confidence, and assurance of Christ is shewn, and his flesh, though laid in the grave, the place of corruption, is said to *rest in hope*, for this very reason because God would not leave his soul in hell. I conclude therefore, that the Descent into Hell is not the enduring the torments of Hell: because if strictly taken, it is not true; if Metaphorically taken, though it be true, yet it is not pertinent.

The third Opinion, which is also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, the Soul of Christ is taken for his body, and Hell for the grave; and consequently, in the Creed, *He descended into hell*, is no more then this, that Christ in his body was laid into the grave. This Explication ordinavily is rejected, by denying that the soul is ever taken for the body, or hell for the grave; but in vain: for it must be acknowledged that sometimes the Scriptures are rightly so, and cannot otherwise be understood. First, the same word in the Hebrew, which the Psalmist used, and in the Greek, which the Apostle used, and we translate the soul, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man, and

† The Hebrew word is שׁוֹנֵה, and the Greek ψυχή, which is translated שׁוֹנֵה.

ἐκείνη τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἔδου, Psal. 16. 10. But both שׁוֹנֵה and ψυχή are used for the body of a dead man, Numb. 6. 6. and it is so translated; For Moses speaking there of a Nazarite, gives this law, All the dayes that he separateth himself unto the Lord, he shall come at no dead body, in the Original שׁוֹנֵה לֹא יָבֹא שׁוֹנֵה, and in the LXX οὐκ ἐγγίσκει ψυχῇ τεθνηκυῖα ἐκ ἐκεῖθεν. In the same manner the law for the High Priest, Levit. 21. 11, Neither shall he go

in to any dead body, וְעַל כָּל נֶפֶשׁ מֵת לֹא יִבֹּא, *Kai' eni psuchē tetigēnē* καὶ ἐκ ψυχῆς. And the generall law, Lev. 22. 4. And who so toucheth any thing that is unclean by the dead, וְהִנָּגַע בְּכֵל טְמֵא מֵמֵת, καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκαθάρτος ἔσται ψυχῆς. which is further cleared by that of Numb. 12. 11. He that toucheth the dead body of any man, Qui tetigerit cadaver hominis; and verse 13. Who-so-ever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead. Omnis qui tetigerit humanæ animæ morticinum: therefore the טָמֵא and ψυχῆ in Levit. 22. 4. doe signifie the cadaver or morticinum; as also Num. 5. 2. Who-so-ever is defiled by the dead, טָמֵא מֵמֵת כָּל מַיְטָא אֲדָרְסוֹת עִנִּי פְּסוּלָא, pollutum super mortuo. And טָמֵא מֵמֵת, ἀκαθάρτος ἐν ψυχῇ, Hag. 2. 13. is rightly translated, one that is unclean by a dead body. Thus severall times טָמֵא and ψυχῆ are taken for the body of a dead man; that body which polluted a man under the law by the touch thereof. And Maimonides hath observed, that there is no pollution from the body till the soul be departed; therefore טָמֵא and ψυχῆ did signifie the body after the separation of the soul. And this was anciently observed by S. Augustine, that the Soul may be taken for the body onely. Animæ nomine corpus solum posse significari, modo quodam locutionis ostenditur, quo significatur per id quod continetur illud quod continet; sicut ait quidam, Vina coronant, cum coronarentur vasa vinaria, vinum enim continetur & vas continet. Sicut ergo appellamus Ecclesiam Basilicam qua continetur populus, qui vere appellatur Ecclesia, ut nomine Ecclesiæ, id est, populi qui continetur significemus locum qui continet: ita quod animæ corporibus continentur, intelligi corpora filiorum per nominatas animas possunt. Sic enim melius accipitur etiam illud, quod Lex inquinari dicit eum qui intraverit super animam mortuam, hoc est, super defuncti cadaver; ut nomine animæ mortuæ mortuum corpus intelligatur, quod animam continebat; quia & absente populo, id est Ecclesia, locus tamen ille nihilominus Ecclesia nuncupatur. Epist. 157. ad Opratum, de Animarum Origine.

translated so. And when we read in *Moses* of a prohibition given to the High-Priest, or to the *Nazarite*, of going tooor coming near a dead body, & of the pollution by the dead; the *dead body* in the *Hebrew* and the *Greek* is nothing else but that which elswhere signifieth the *soul*: and Mr. *Ainsworth*, who translated the *Pentateuch* nearer the letter then the sense, hath so delivered it in compliance with the Originall phrase, and may be well interpreted thus by our

Levitic. 19. 28.

21. 1.

22. 4.

Translation, *Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting for a soul, that is, for the dead. For a soul he shall not defile himself among his peoples, that is, There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people. He that toucheth any thing that is unclean by a soul, that is, by the dead. Every*

one

me defiled by a soul, that is, by the dead. He shall not come Numb. 5. 2.
at a dead soul, that is, he shall come at no dead body. Thus 6. 6.

Ainsworths Translation sheweth that in all these places the Originall word is that which usually signifieth the soul, and our Translation teacheth us that though in other places it signifieth the soul, yet in these it must be taken for the body, and that body bereft of the soul. Secondly, the word which the Psalmist used in *Hebrew*, and the Apostle in *Greek*, and is translated *Hell*, doth certainly in some other places signifie no more then the *grave*, and is translated so. As where Mr. *Ainsworth* following the

† The Hebrew word is שׂאול, the Greek ἄνους, כִּי לֹא תַעֲזֹב נַפְשׁוֹ לְשׂאֹול ὅτι ἄνους ἐστίν.

תאמר להם יִשְׁכַּח מִן הַחַיִּים אֶת הַמֵּת, (or *עֵשׂ אֶת הַמֵּת*, as it is read in the AEs, and in the Psalms also, by the ancient MS. at S. James's.) And these generally run together, and sometimes signify no more than the grave, as Gen. 37. 35. where Jacob thinking that his son Joseph had bin dead, breaks out into this sad expression, כִּי אֵרָא אֶת אֲדָמָה, *בְּנִי אֲדָמָה*, ὅτι καταβήσμαι πρὸς τὸν ὕδωρ μετὰ πένθων εἰς ᾧδου, which we translate, For I will goe down into the grave unto my son mourning, upon the authority of the ancient Targums. For although that of Onkelos keep the Original word *לְשִׁאול*; yet the Jerusalem Targum and that of Jonathan render it *לְבֵי קְבוּרָתָא*, in domum sepulchri; and the Persian Targum to the same purpose, *בְּגוֹר*, as also the Arabick Translation, Imo descendam ad pulverem mœstus de filio meo. So Gen. 42. 38. וְהוֹרַדְתֶּם אֶת שְׁבִטִי בִּיגוֹן שְׂאוּלָה, κατὰ ξυδί μου δὲ τῆς γῆρας μετὰ λυπῆς εἰς ᾧδου; which we translate Then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the grave. Where the Jerusalem Targum and that of Jonathan have it again *לְבֵי קְבוּרָתָא*, and the Persian again *בְּגוֹר*, in sepulchrum; the Arabick *أَلَى أَلْتَرَى*, ad pulverem, or ad terram. And it is observed by the Jewish Commentators that those Christians are mistaken, who interpret those words spoken by Jacob, I will goe down into Sheol, of Hell, observing that Sheol there is nothing else but the grave.

word, *For I will goe down unto my son, mourning to hell.* Gen. 37. 35.
Our Translation aiming at the sense rendreth it, *For I will*
go down into the grave unto my son mourning. So again
he, *Te shall bring down my grey hairs with sorrow unto* 42. 38.
Hell, that is, *to the grave.* And in this sense we say, *the*
Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to the I Sam. 2. 6.
grave and bringeth up.

Now being the *Soul* is sometimes taken for the body
deserted by the soul, and *Hell* is also sometimes taken for
the

the grave the receptacle of the body dead, therefore it is conceived that the Prophet did intend these significations in those words, *I thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*; and consequently, the Article grounded on that Scripture must import no more then this, Christ in respect of his body be-
rest of his soul, which was recommended into, and deposited in the hands of his Father, *descended into the grave*.

* *Ruffinus, who first mentioned this Article, did interpret it of the grave, as we have already observed, but yet he did believe a Descent distinct from that, in the Exposition of the Creed. Sed & quod in infernum descendit, evidenter præ-*

nunciatur in Psalmis, &c. and then citing that of S. Peter, Unde & Petrus dixit, Quia Christus mortificatus carne, vivificatus autem spiritu, In ipso ait, Et qui in carcere inclusi erant in diebus Noe, in quo etiam quid operis egerit in inferno declaratur.

† *I shew'd before, that in the Creed made at Sirmium there was the Descent mentioned, and the buriall omitted, and yet that Descent was so expressed, that it could not be taken for the buriall: besides I adde, that it was made by the Arians, who in few yeares before had given another Creed, in which both the Buriall and the Descent were mentioned; as was Nice in Thracia, ἀνοδόντα, καὶ ταφόντα, καὶ εἰς τὰ κατὰ χθονία κατήβητα, ὃν αὐτὸς ὁ ᾄδης ἱερέμαζεν, Theodoret. Histor. lib. 2. cap. 21. and not long after gave in another at Constantinople to the same purpose, σκαμπόντα, καὶ ἀνο-*

The

ἡ ψὺς τὰ πάντα, καὶ οἱ τὰ καταχθόνια διήλκυοντο, ὅτι τίνα καὶ αὐτὸς;
 ἡ ψὺς τὰ πάντα, Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 4.

The next opinion is, that the Soul may well be understood either for the nobler part of man distinguish'd from the body; or else for the person of man consisting of both soul and body, as it often is; or for the living soul as it is distinguish'd from the immortall spirit: but then the term *Hell* shall signifie no place, neither of the man, nor of the body, nor the soul; but onely the state or condition of men in death during the separation of the soul from the body. So that the Prophecie shall run thus, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, that is, Thou shalt not suffer me to remain in the common state of the dead, to be long deprived of my naturall life, to continue without exercise, or power of exercising my vitall faculty: And the Creed will have this sense, that Christ was crucified, dead, and buried, and *descended into Hell*, that is, he went unto the dead, and remained for a time in the state of death, as other dead men doe.

But this Interpretation supposeth that which can never appear, that *Hades* signifieth not death it self, nor the place where soules departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permanfion in death; which is a Notion wholly new, and consequently cannot interpret that which representeth something known and believed of old, according to the Notions and conceptions of those times. And that this Notion is wholly new, will appear, because not any of the ancient Fathers is produced to avow it, nor any of the Heathen Authors which are produced doe affirm it: Nay, it is evident that the *Greeks* did alwayes by *Hades* understand a place into which the souls of men were carried and conveyed distinct and separate from that place in which we live; and that their different opinions shew, some placing it in the earth, some under it, some in one unknown place of it, some in another. But especially *Hades* in the judgement of the ancient

ooo

Greeks

§ 1. The Opinion

of the ancient
Greeks in this
case is excel-
lently express'd

by Tertullian, who shewes three kinds of men to be thought not to descend ad inferos when they dye: the first Insepulti, the second Aori, the third Bizothanati. Creditum est, insepultos non ante ad inferos redigi quam iusta perceperint. *De Anima*, cap. 56. Aiunt & immatura morte præventas eoque vagari isth'c donec reliquias compleatur ætatis, quacum pervixissent, si non tempestive obissent. *Ibid.* Proinde extorres inferum habebuntur, quas vi ereptas arbitrantur, præcipue per atrocitates suppliciorum; crucis dico & securis & gladii & feræ. *Ib.* The souls then of those whose bodies were unb'ried, were thought to be kept out of Hades till their funerals were perform'd, and the souls of them who dyed an untimely or violent death, were kept from the same place until the time of their naturall death should come. This he further expresses in the terms of the Magicians, whose art was conversant about souls departed. Aut optimum est hic retineri secundum ahoros (i.e. *aiōres*) aut pessimum; secundum Bizothanatos (*βιαιοθανάτους*) ut ipse jam vocabulis utar, quibus austerix opinionum istarum Magica sonat, Hostanes & Typhon & Dardanus, & Damigeron & Neclabis & Bernice. Publica jam literaturæ est quæ animas etiam iusta ætate sopitas, etiam proba morte disjunctas, etiam prompta humatione disjunctas evocaturam se ab inferum incolatu pollicetur, cap. 57. Of this of the Insepulti, he produceth the example of Patroclus, secundum Homericum Patroclum funus in somnis de Achille flagrantem, quod non alio adire portas inferum posset, arcentibus eum longe animabus sepulcorum. The place he intended is that *Iliad*. ψ.

Θάλα μὲ ἔη τὰ χρεὶα πύλαι αἰδαιο κρήνην,
Τῆλ' αὖ μὲ σίρηνων ψυχὰς, ὅ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καμάντων,
Ὅδ' αὖ μὲ πῶς μισομένην ἔσθ' ὁ πύλαι μὲν εἶδον.

In the same manner he describes Elpenor, *Odys.* λ'.

Πρώτῃ δ' ἦν ψυχή· Ἐλπινόρου θ' ἦλθεν ἐπαυροῦ,
Ὅν γάρ πω ἐπὶ δαίτῃ κατὰ χθονὸς οὐρουσσεύεις.

Where it is the observation of Eustathius, ὅτι δὲ ἔξα ἦν τοῖς Ἕλλησι πύλαι τῆς κρήνης ψυχὰς μὴ ἀναμύγνυνθαι τοῖς λοιπῶν. Legimus præterea in Sexto, insepultas animas vagas esse, *Serv. in Æneid.* 3. The place which he intended I suppose is this

Hæc omnis, quam cernis inops, inhumataque turbæ est;
Portitor ille Charon; hi quos vehit unda sepulti;
Nec ripas datur horrendas, nec rauca fluentæ.

Transportare prius quam sedibus ossa quierunt;
Centum errant annos, volitantque hinc litora circum.

but never any doubted but that it signified some place or other; and if they had conceived any such notion, as the state of death & the permanſion of the dead in that ſtate, they need not to have fallen into thoſe doubts or queſtions; the Paſſage and the Prophets being as certainly in the ſtate of death and remaining ſo, as *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*.

Thus he is to be underſtood in the deſcription of the Funerall of Polydorus *Æneid. 3.*
Ergo inſtauramus Polydoro

ſolus, & ingens Aggeritur tumulo tellus, animamque ſepulchro Condimus.
The ſoul of Polydorus does there ſignifie the body, as ſome have obſerved, but that the ſoul of Polydorus was then in reſt when his body had received funerrall rites; as *Servius*, Legimus præterea in Sexto inſepulcorum animas vagas eſſe, & hinc conſtanter legitime ſepultum fuiſſe. Rite ergo reddita legitima ſepultura, redit ad quietem ſepulchri, ſaith *Servius*; or rather in the ſenſe of *Virgil*, ad quietem inferni, according to the petition of *Palinurus*, Sedibus ut ſaltem placidis in morte quietem. And that the ſoul of Polydorus was ſo wandring about the place where he lay unburied, appeareth out of *Euripides* in *Hecuba*, where he ſpeaketh thus, *Ἡδὲ μὲν τὰς ψυχὰς Ἐκδὲς αἴτω, Καὶ ἐν μὲν οὐρανῷ ἔχον, Τερταὶον ἀπολύει αἰσέμεναι.* And in the *Troades* of the ſame Poet this way, or errant vagabunda inſepulcorum, is acknowledged by the Chorus in theſe words, *Ἦ μὴ, ἂν πόντος, Σὺ μὲν φθίψῃς ἀλκίως Ἀδμήτῃ, ἀνδρῶν.* And when their bodies were buried, then their ſoules paſſed into Hades, to the reſt. So was Polydorus, and that man mentioned in the Hiſtory of the Philoſopher *Athenodorus*, whoſe umbra or phlaſma walked after his death. Inveniantur ossa infernæ in cineribus & implicita, quæ corpus ævo terraque putrefactum nuda & exesa reliquerat in cineribus: collecta publice ſepeliuntur; domus poſtea rite conditis manibus erigit; *Plin. l. 7. Epiſt. 27.* This was the caſe of the Inſepulchriti: and for that of the *Biothanati*, it is remarkable that *Dido* threatneth *Æneas*,

----- ſequar atris ignibus abſens,
Et cum frigida mors anima ſeduxerit artus,
Omnibus umbra locis ahero. -----

in which place *Servius* obſerves, Dicunt Phyſici Biothanatorum animas non recipere in originem ſuam, niſi vagantes legitimum tempus ſati compleverint; quod poſtea ad ſepulturam transferunt, ut *Centum errant annos*. Hoc ergo nunc dicam, Occiſura me ante diem ſum; vaganti mihi dabis poenas; Nam te perſequar, & ahero quamdiu erravero ſemper.

or, or any perſon which is certainly condemned to everlaſting flames. Though therefore it be certainly true, that *Chriſt* did truly and properly dye, as other men are wont

to doe, and that after expiration he was in the state or condition of the dead; in deadlyhood, as some have learn't to speak; yet the Creed had spoken as much as this before, when it delivered that he *was dead*. And although 'tis true that he might have dyed, and in the next minute of time reviv'd, and consequently his death doth not, precisely taken, signifie any permanſion or duration in the ſtate of death, and therefore it might be added, *he deſcended into hell*, to ſignifie further a permanſion or duration in that condition; yet if Hell doe ſignifie nothing elſe but the ſtate of the dead, as this opinion doth ſuppoſe, then to *deſcend into hell*, is no more then to be dead, and ſo notwithstanding any duration implied in that expreſſion, Chriſt might have aſcended the next minute after he deſcended thither, as well as he might be imagined to revive the next minute after he dyed. Being then to *deſcend into Hell*, according to this Interpretation, is no more then to be dead; being no man ever doubted but that perſon was dead who dyed; being it was before delivered in the Creed that Chriſt dyed, or as we render it, *was dead*; we cannot imagine but they which did adde this part of the Article to the Creed, did intend ſomething more then this, and therefore we cannot admit this Notion, as a full or proper Expoſition.

There is yet left another Interpretation grounded upon the generall opinion of the Church of Chriſt in all ages, & upon a probable expoſition of the Prophecy of the Pſalmiſt, taking the *ſoul* in the moſt proper ſenſe, for the ſpirit or rationall part of Chriſt; that part of man which according to our Saviours doctrine the *Jews* could not kill; and looking upon *hell* as a place diſtinct from this part of the world where we live, & diſtinguiſhed from thoſe heavens whether Chriſt aſcended, into which place the ſoules of men were conveyed after or upon their death: and therefore thus expounding the words of the Pſalmiſt in the perſon of Chriſt. Thou ſhalt not ſuffer that ſoul of mine, which

which shall be forced from my body by the violence of pain upon the crosse, but resigned into thy hands, when it shall goe into that place below where the soules of men departed are detained; I say, thou shalt not suffer that soul to continue there as theirs have done; but shalt bring it shortly from thence and reunite it to my body.

For the better understanding of this Exposition, there are severall things to be observed, both in respect of the matter of it, and in reference to the authority of the Fathers. First therefore, this must be laid down as a certain and necessary truth, that the soul of man, when he dyeth, dyeth not, but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure, according to the ground of our Saviours counsell, *Fear not them which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul.* Mat. 10. 28. That better part of us therefore in and after death doth exist and live, either by virtue of it's spirituall and immortall nature, as we believe, or at least by the will of God, and his power upholding and preserving it from dissolution, as many of the Fathers thought. This soul thus existing after death, and separated from the body, though of a nature spirituall, is really and truly in some place; if not by way of circumscription as proper bodies are, yet by way of determination and indistancy, so that it is true to say, this soul is really and truly present here, and not elsewhere.

Again, the soul of man, which while he lived gave life to the body, and was the fountain of all vitall actions, in that separate existence after death must not be conceiv'd to sleep, or be bereft and stript of all vitall operations, but still to exercise the powers of understanding and of willing, and to be subject to the affections of joy and sorrow. Upon which is grounded the different estate and condition of the soules of men during that time of separation; some of them by the mercy of God being placed in peace, and rest, joy, and happinesse, others by the justice of the same God, left to sorrow, pains, and misery.

As there was this different state and condition before our Saviours death, according to the different kinds of men in this life, the wicked and the just, the elect and reprobate; so there was two societies of soules after death, one of them which were happy in the presence of God, the other of those which were left in their finnes, and tormented for them. Thus we conceive the righteous *Abel* the first man placed in this happinesse, and the soules of them that departed in the same faith to be gathered to him. Whosoever it was of the sonnes of *Adam* which first dyed in his finnes, was put into a place of torment; and the soules of all those which departed after with the wrath of God upon them, were gathered into his sad society.

Now as the soules at the hour of death are really separated from the bodies, so the place where they are in rest or misery after death, is certainly distinct from the place in which they liv'd. They continue not where they were at that instant when the body was left without life; they do not go together with the body to the grave, but as the sepulchre is appointed for our flesh, so there is another receptacle, or habitation, and mansion for our spirits. From whence it followeth, that in death the soul doth certainly passe by a reall motion from that place in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place, and unto that society, which God of his mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to enquire into the difference and distance of those severall habitations (but for method sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the Infernall parts, or the Mansions below) it will appear to have bin the generall judgement of the Church, that the soul of Christ contradistinguish'd from his body, that better and more noble part of his humanity, his ratiounall and intellectuall soul after a true and proper separation from his flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below, where the soules of men before departed were detained;

joined; and that by such a real translation of his soul he was truly said to have descended into Hell.

Many have bin the Interpretations of the opinion of the Fathers made of late; and their differences are made to appear so great, as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this point: whereas there is nothing which they agree in more then this which I have already affirm'd, a real descent of the soul of Christ unto the habitation of the soules departed. The persons to whom and end for which he descended they differ in, but as to a locall descent into the infernall parts they all agree. Who were then in those parts they could not certainly define; but whosoere were there, that Christ by the presence of his soul was with them they all determined.

That this was the Generall opinion of the Church, will appear not onely by those many testimonies of those [†] ancient writers which lived successively, and wrote in severall ages, and delivered this exposition in such expresse terms as are not capable of any other interpretation; but also because it was generally used as an Argument against the

[†] As Irenæus
l. 5. c. 26. Cū
enim Dominus
in medio um-
bræ mortis ab-
ierit ubi animæ

Apoli- mortuorum e-

sunt, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit... manifestum est, quia & discipulorum ejus, propter quos & hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum definitum eis à Deo, &c. Clemens Alexandrinus was so clearly of that opinion, that he thought the soul of Christ preached salvation to the soules in hell. Strom. lib. 6. and Tertullian proves that the Inferi are a Cavity in the earth where the souls of dead men are, because the soul of Christ went thither. De Anima, cap. 55. Quod si Christus Deus, quia & homo mortuus secundum scripturas, & sepultus secundum eandem, hic quoque legi satisfecit forma humanæ mortis apud Inferos fuit, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cælorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic Patriarchas & Prophetas compotes sui faceret; habes & regionem Inferum subterraneam credere, & illos cubito pelleret, qui satis superbe non putant animas fidelium inferis dignas. *Τὸ μὴ σῶμα τὸ ἁγίου* & *ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς ζωῆς* Orig. contra Celsum, l. 2. Ipsa anima, cū fuit in abyssu, jam non est, quia scriptum est non derelinques animam meam in inferno. S. Ambros. de Incarn. cap. 5. Si ergo secundum hominem quem Verbum Deus suscepit putamus dictum esse, *Hæc mecum eris in Paradiso*, non ex his verbis in cælo existimandus est esse Paradisus. Neque enī in ipso die in cælo futurus erat homo Christus Iesus, sed in inferno secundum animam, in sepulchro autem secundum carnem. Et de carne quidem, quod eo die in sepulchro sit posita, manifestum.

nifestum est Evangelium. Quod vero illa anima in infernum descenderit, Apostolica doctrina prædicat. Quandoquidem B. Petrus ad hanc rem testimonium de Psalmis adhibet, *Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in inferno, neque dabis sancti tui videre corruptionem.* Illud de anima dictum est, quia ibi non est derelicta unde tam cito remeavit; illud de corpore, quod in sepulchro corruptioni celeri resurrectione non potuit. S. August. *Epist. 57. ad Dardanum.* Καταβὰς γὰρ χειρὶ καὶ πόδι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, κατέβη δ' ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας, ψυχὴν ἔδωκεν ὅτι οὐκ ἔμελλεν ἀποβῆναι. Πείθει οὖν ἡμεῖς ὅτι Αἰδὼς ὁ παλαιός, καὶ λαοβόρος οὐκ ἔμελλεν ἀποβῆναι. Synes. *Hymn. 9.* Ψυχὴ ἢ ἡ θεία πῶς ποτε αὐτὸν λαχούσα σωδρομῶν πρὸς τὴν ἐν ὁρῶν κατὰ πείρασμά τοι μὴ εἰς ἄδου, διοφροσύνη ἢ σωφροσύνη καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνῳ πνεύματι κατὰ πείρασμόν. Cyril Alex. *Dial. de incarn.* Ὁ αὖτε ἰδὼς αὐτὸν σῶμα μόνον ἐπεδίδετο, ψυχὴν δ' ἐμὴν ἔδωκεν. Anastas. apud Euthy. *Pan. l.* Postquam igitur exaltatus est, id est, à iudæis in cruce suspensus, & spiritum reddidit, unita suæ Divinitati Anima ad inferorum profunda descendit, *Autor. Serm. d. Tempore.* Corpore in sepulchroposito, Divinitas cum anima hominis ad inferna descendens vocavit de locis suis animas sanctorum Gaudentius Brix. *Tract. 10.* In hoc Divinitas Christi virtutem suæ impassibilitatis ostendit, quæ ubique semper & ineffabiliter præsens, & secundum carnem suam in inferno sine doloribus fuit, & secundum animam suam in sepulchro sine corruptione jacuit; quia nec carni suæ defuit, cum animam suam in inferno dolere non sineret; nec animam suam in inferno deseruit cum in sepulchro carnem suam à corruptione servaret, *Fulgent. ad Trasimund. l. 3. c. 31.*

Apollinarian Heresie. Then which nothing can shew more the generall opinion of the Catholicks and the Hereticks, and that not onely of the present but of the precedent ages. For it had bin little lesse then ridiculous to have produced that for an argument to prove a point in Controversie, which had not bin clearer then that which was controverted, and had not bin some way acknowledged as a truth by both. Now the errour of *Apollinarian* was, that Christ had no proper intellectuall or rational soul, but that the Word was to him in the place of a soul: and the † Argument produced by the Fathers for the conviction of this errour was, that Christ descended into Hell; which the *Apollinarians* could not deny, and that this de-

† what the Apollinarian Heresie was is certain'y known, they denied that

Christ had an humane soul, affirming that the word was to him in the place of a soul. Apollinaristas Apollinaris instituit, qui de anima Christi à Catholicis dissecrunt, dicentes, sicut Arriani, Deum Christum carnem sine anima suscepisse. In qua questione testimoniis Evangelicis victi, mentem qua rationalis est anima hominis

hensibilem ab inferis potuisse concludi, ut nec ipsam adsumptionis animam aut exitabiliter susceptam aut tenaciter derelictam, sed nec carnem ejus credimus contagione alicujus corruptionis infectam. Ipsi namque vox est in Psalmo, sicut Petrus interpretatur Apostolus, *Non derelinques animam meam apud inferos, neque sanctum tuum videre corruptionem*, Epist. ad Hispanos. Lastly, the true Doctrine of the Incarnation against all the enemies thereof, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and the like, was generally expressed by declaring the verity of the soul of Christ really present in Hell, and the verity of his body at the same time really present in the grave, as it is excellently delivered by Fulgentius, *Humanitas vera Filii Dei nec tota in sepulchro fuit, nec tota in inferno; sed in sepulchro secundum veram carnem Christus mortuus jacuit, & secundum animam ad infernum Christus descendit, & secundum eandem animam ab inferno ad carnem, quam in sepulchro reliquerat, rediit: secundum divinitatem vero suam, quæ nec loco tenetur nec fine concluditur, totus fuit in sepulchro cum carne, totus in inferno cum anima; ac pro hoc plenus fuit ubique Christus, quia non est Deus ab humanitate quam suscepit separatus, qui & in anima sua fuit, ut solutis inferni doloribus ab inferno vix citius rediret, & in carne sua fuit, ut celeri resurrectione corrumpi non posset*, *Ad Trasimund.* lib. 3. cap. 34.

scant was not made by his divinity or by his body, but by the motion and presence of his soul, and consequently that he had a soul distinct both from his flesh and from the Word. Whereas if it could have then bin answer'd by the Hereticks, as now it is by many, that his descent into Hell had no relation to his soul, but to his body onely, which descended into the grave; or that it was not a real but onely virtuall descent, by which his death extended to the destruction of the powers of hell; or that his soul was not his intellectuall spirit or immortall soul, but his living soul which descended into hell, that is, continued in the state of death: I say, if any of these senses could have bin affixed to this Article, the Apollinarians answer might have bin found, and the Catholicks Argument of no validity. But being those Hereticks did all acknowledge this Article; being the Catholick Fathers did urge the same to prove the real distinction of the soul of Christ both from his divinity and from his body, because his body was really in the grave when his soul was really present with the soules below; it followeth that it was the general

all doctrine of the Church, that Christ did descend into hell, by a locall motion of his soul, separated from his body, to the places below where the souls of men departed were.

The onely question which admitted any variety of discrepance among the Ancients, was, who were the persons to whose soules the soul of Christ descended, and that which dependeth on that question, what was the end and use of his descent. In this indeed they differed much, according to their severall apprehensions of the condition of the dead, and the nature of the place into which the soules before our Saviours death were gathered. Some looking on that name, which we translate now hell, *Hades* or *infernus*, as the † common receptacle of the soules of all men, both the just and unjust, thought the soul of Christ descended unto those which departed in the true faith and fear of God, the soules of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, and the people of God. But

† some of the Ancien Fathers did believe that the word *Ἅδης* in the Scriptures had the

others same significa-

tion which it hath among the Greeks, as comprehending all the soules both of the wicked and the just, and so they took *Infernus* in the same latitude. As therefore the ancient Greeks did assigne one *Ἅδης* for all which dyed; Πάντας ὁμῶς θνῆσθαι εἰς αἵδης λέγεται and Εἰς κοινὸν ἅδης πάντες ἤξουσιν βροτοί. As they made within that one *Ἅδης* two severall receptacles, one for the good and vertuous; the other for the wicked and unjust, according unto that of Diphilus, Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἅδης δύο τεῖβες ἔχεται, Μίαν δικαίων, καὶ τέραν ἀσεβῶν ὁδὸν: and that of Plato, Οὐ τοὶ γὰρ θνήσκουσιν τελευτῶσι, δικάσουσιν ἐν τῷ λεγμένῳ ἐν τῇ τεῖβῃ, ὅς τις φέρειν ταῖς, ἢ μὲν οἰς μακάρων νῆους, ἢ δ' οἰς τάρταρον and that of Virgil,

Hic locus est partes ubi se via findit in ambas;
Dextera quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit:
Hac iter Elysium nobis; at læva malorum
Exercet pœnas, & ad impia Tartara mittit.

As they did send the best of men to *Ἅδης* there to be happy, and taught rewards to be received there as well as punishment; Λίγα γὰρ ἔσθ' οὗτο μάλιστα Πινδαρου παύτῃ φιλοῦσι βίων ἐν ἅδῃ, Τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος ἀελίου καὶ ἐν δαδὶ νόκτα καὶ τῷ σὺν ἡμέραις τα λεγμένῃς οἰσι παράσκειν αὐτοῖς, &c. Plur. de Consolat. ad Apollon. Ὁ περὶ λαβῆς Κῆνοι βροτῶν, οἱ ταῦτα διαρχθέντες τέλει Μολῶσ' ἐς ἅδῃ. καὶ γὰρ μόνος ὁνοῖ Ζῆν ἐστὶ τοῖς δ' ἀγοισι παύτ' ὁνοῖ κακά, Sophocles. So did

the Jews also before and after our Saviours time. For Josephus says the soule of Samuel was brought up ἐξ ᾧδου , and delivers the opinion of the Pharisees after this manner, Antiq. Jud. l. 18. c. 2. $\text{Ἀδελφὸν τὸ ἰσχυρὸν πίστις αὐτοῦ ἐν ᾧ ὑπὸ χθονὸς διακινεῖται τε καὶ πάλιν οἷς ἀρετῇς ἢ κακίαις ἐπιτρεφόμενος ἐν τῷ βίῳ ζῶντι}$ and of the Sadducees after this manner, $\text{Ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν, καὶ τὰς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν καὶ πάλιν ἀναστῆναι}$. Therefore the Jews, which thought the soules immortal, did believe that the just were rewarded as well as the unjust punished $\text{καὶ οἱ καλοὶ καὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐν ᾧδῳ}$. And so did also most of the Ancient Fathers of the Church. There was an Ancient book written de Universa natura, which some attributed to Justine Martyr, some to Irenæus, others to Origen, or to Caius a Presbyter of the Roman Church in the time of Victor and Zephyrinus, a Fragment of which is set forth by David Hoeschelius in his Annotations upon Photius, delivering the state of ᾧδου at large. $\text{Περὶ δὲ ᾧδου ἐν ᾧ σωζέονται ψυχὰι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων ἀναγκαστικῶς πένειν}$. Here then were the just and unjust in Hades, but not in the same place. $\text{Οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι ἐν τῷ ᾧδῳ ἔνθα ἔστι σωζέοντες, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ ᾧ καὶ οἱ ἀδικοὶ. Μὴ γὰρ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ χεῖρον κἀδόδου, &c.}$ There was but passage into that Hades, said he; but when that gate was pass'd, the just went on the right hand to a place of happiness ($\text{ἐν τῷ δὲ ὄνομα κυκλῶσιν καὶ κόλπον Ἀβραάμ}$) and the unjust on the left to a place of misery. $\text{Οὗτος ὁ ᾧδὸς ἑστὶν ὁ ᾧδὸς ὁ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ᾧ οἱ καλοὶ καὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐστὶν}$. Tertullian wrote a Treatise de Paradiso, now not extant, in which he express'd thus much, *Habes etiam de Paradiso à nobis libellum, quo constituimus omnem animam apud Inferos sequestrari in diem Domini, De Anima cap. 55.* S. Jerome on the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, *Ante adventum Christi omnia ad Inferos pariter ducebantur: Unde & Jacob ad inferos pariter descensurum se dicit; & Job pios & impios in Inferno queritur retentari; & Evangelium, Chaos magnum interpositum apud Inferos; & Abraham cum Lazaro, & divitem in suppliciis esse testatur.* $\text{τὸ ᾧδὸν οὗτο ἐστὶν ὁ ᾧδὸς αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ᾧδῳ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ᾧ οἱ καλοὶ καὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐστὶν}$. S. Chrysostom Panegyricus ad Eusebium Mart. And in his Treatise proving that Christ is God, he makes this exposition of Isaiah 45. 2. $\text{Πάλαι χαλχῶς συνδεδεμένος, καὶ μοχλὸς ἰσχυρὸς συντελεσμένος, καὶ ἡνέκα ἐν ᾧδῳ σκωλενοῦ, ἀποκρίσεις, ἀποκρίσεις ἀναδείξω σοι τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἐν τῷ ᾧδῳ}$. $\text{Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ᾧδὸς ἐν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὰς ἐκέρχεται αἰνία καὶ σκεδὴν τιμὰ τὸν ᾧδον}$, τὸν Ἰσαάκ, τὸν Ἰακώβ, διὰ καὶ ἐν ᾧδῳ ἐκέρχεται. This doctrine was maintained by all those who believed that the soul of Samuel was raised by the witch of Endor: for though he were so great a Prophet, yet they thought that he was in Hades, and not onely so, but under the power of Satan. Thus Justine Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, $\text{Φαίνομεν καὶ ὅτι πάσαι αἱ ψυχὰι τῶν ᾧδων ἐκέρχονται ὑπὸ θεοῦ αἰνίαν ἐκέρχονται τῶν τοιούτων δυνάμεων, ὅποια δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῷ ἐκέρχονται ἐκ αὐτῶν ἀποκρίσεων ἀποκρίσεων}$. Who was followed in this by Origen, Anastasius Antiochenus, and others.

† S. Augustine began to doubt of that generall reason ordina-

others there were who thought *Hades* or *Inferno* was never taken in † the Scriptures for any place of happiness and

reafon ordina- vily given of Christs Descent into Hell to bring the Patriarchs and Prophets thence,

upon this ground, that be thought the word Infernus was never taken in the Scriptures with a good sense; Quamquam illud me nondum invenisse confiteor, Inferos appellatos ubi iustorum animæ acquiescunt, De Genesi ad lit. ram, l. 12. c. 33. Proinde, ut dixi, nondum inveni, & adhuc quæro: nec mihi occurrit Inferos alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam duntaxat Canonicam. Ibid. Non facile alicubi Scripturarum Inferorum nomen positum invenitur in bono, Epist. 57. Præsertim quia ipsos quidem Inferos uspiam Scripturarum locis in bono appellatos potui repetire. Quod si nusquam in divinis autoritatibus legitur, non utique sinus ille Abrahæ, id est, secretæ cujusdam quietis habitatio, aliqua pars inferorum fuisse credenda est: quamquam in his ipsis tanti Magistri verbis, ubi ait dixisse Abraham, *Iur vos deus non abas magnum firmatum est*, satis, ut opinor, appareat non esse quandam partem & quasi membrum Inferorum tantæ illius felicitatis summum, Epist. 99.

and therefore they did not conceive the soules of the Patriarchs or the Prophets did passe into any such infernall place; and consequently that the descent into hell was not his going to the Prophets or the Patriarchs which were not there. For as, if it had bin onely said that Christ had gone unto the bosome of *Abram*, or to Paradise, no man would have ever believed that he had descended into hell; so being it is onely written, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell*, it seems incongruous to think that he went then unto the Patriarchs who were not there.

Now this being the diversity of opinions anciently in respect of the persons unto whose soules the soul of Christ descended at his death, the difference of the end or efficacy of that descent is next to be observed. Of those which did believe the name of *Hades* to belong unto that general place which comprehended all the soules of men (as well those which dyed in the favour of God as those which departed in their finnes) † some of them thought that † *This is the* Christ descended to that place of *Hades*, where the soules *Opinion generally received in the Schools, and delivered all as the sense of* of all the faithfull, from the death of the righteous *Abel* to the death of Christ, were detained, and there dissolving *the Church of God in all ages: but though it were not so general, as the Schoolmen would persuade us, yet it is certain that many of the Fathers did so understand it. O* *Εὐσεβίου, Εὐσεβ. de Demost. Evang. l. 10. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν πατέρων ἑρμηνείαν ἡ ἐκείνη ἀντίστασις* Euseb. de Demost. Evang. l. 10. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν τῶν πατέρων ἑρμηνείαν ἡ ἐκείνη ἀντίστασις

καὶ θεν αὐτῶσθ) τοῦ διχάου. Cyril. Catech. 4. Ἡμελλε γὰρ ἡ θεότης τοῦ κυρίου τα πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸ μυστήριον τῶ πᾶθους, καὶ σωτῆρ τῆ ψυχῆ καταλθεῖν εἰς τὰ κατὰ χθόνια, ὅτι τὸ ἐργάσαθαι τὴν ἐκείνῃ περὶ κακοιμμένων σωτηρίαν, οὐκ ἔστι ἀλλ' ἢ πρὸς βίαν. Translatatus erat Enoc, raptus Elias; sed non est servus supra Dominum. Nullus enim ascendit in Cœlum, nisi qui descendit de cœlo. Nam & Moysen, licet corpus ejus non apparuerit in terris, nusquam tamen in gloria cœlesti legimus, nisi postquam Dominus suæ resurrectionis pignore vincula solvit inferni, & piorum animas elevavit. S. Ambros. l. 4. de Fide ad Gratianum. Qui in eo loco detinebantur sancti, vinculorum solutionem in Christi adventu sperabant. Nemo enim ab Inferni sedibus liberatur nisi per Christi gratiam. Eo igitur post mortem Christus descendit. Ut Angelus in caminum Babylonis ad tres pueros liberandos descendit, ita Christus ad fornacem descendit Inferni, in quo clausæ iustorum animæ tenebantur. Postquam eo descendit, inferorum claustra pertodit, diripuit, vastavit, spoliavit, victas inde animas liberando, S. Hieron. in Ecclesiast.

all the power by which they were detain'd below, translated them into a farre more glorious place, and estated them in a condition farre more happy in the heavens above. Others of them understood no such translation of place, or alteration of condition there, conceiving that the soules of all men are † detain'd below still, and shall not enter into heaven untill the generall resurrection. They made no such distinction at the death of Christ, as if those which believed in a Saviour to come, should be kept out from heaven till he came; and those which now believe in the same Saviour already come, should be admitted thither immediately upon their expiration.

† Justine Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho first begins
 Ἀλλὰ μὲν ἐπεὶ
 ἀποθνήσκουσιν
 οὐκ ἔτι πᾶσαι τὰς
 ψυχὰς ἐν
 (ἐρμηνείᾳ γὰρ
 ἡν ὡς ἀνέειπεν

τοῖς κακοῖς) ὅμα τί; τὰς μὲν εὐσεβῶν ἐν κρείττονι ποιεῖν ὁρῶμεν, τὰς δὲ ἀδίκων καὶ πονηρῶν ἐν χολῇ, τὸν δὲ κρείττω ἐκδεχόμεναι χθόνα τότε. After him Irenæus, l. 5. 26. Cum Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit ubi animæ mortuorum erant, post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, & post resurrectionem assumptus est, manifestum est quia & discipulorum ejus, propter quos & hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in invisibilem locum definitum eis à Deo, & ibi usque ad resurrectionem commorabuntur, sustinentes resurrectionem; post recipientes corpora & perfecte resurgentes, hoc est, corporaliter, quemadmodum & Dominus resurrexit, sic venient in conspectum Dei. Nemo enim est discipulus super magistrum; perfectus autem omnis erit sicut magister ejus. Quomodo ergo Magister noster non statim-evolans abiit, sed sustinens definitum à Patre resurrectionis suæ tempus (quod & per Ionam manifestum est) post triduum resurgens assumptus est; sic & nos sustinere debemus definitum à Deo resurrectionis nostræ tempus prænuntiatum à Prophetis, & sic resurgentes assumi, quotquot

Dominus

Dominus hoc dignos habuerit. Tertullian followeth Irenæus in this particular, Habes & regionem Inferum subterraneam credere, & illos cubito pellere qui satis superbe non putent animas fidelium inferis dignas, servi super Dominum & discipuli super magistrum, aspernati si forte in Abrahamæ sinu expectandæ resurrectionis solarium carpere *De Anima, cap. 55.* Nu'li patet cœlum terra adhuc salva, ne dixerim clausa. Cum transactione enim mundi referabuntur regna cœlorum, *Ibid.* Eam itaque regione in sinum dico Abrahamæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat. *Act. Mart. l. 4. c. 34.* Omnes ergo animæ penes Inferos? inquis. Velis & nolis, & supplicia jam illic & refrigeria habes pauperem & divitem. Cur enim non putes animam & puniri & foveri in inferis, interim sub expectatione utriusque iudicii in quadam usurpatione & candida ejus? *De Anima, c. p. 58.* S. Hilary in his *Commentary upon those words of the Psalm*, Dominus custodiet & introitum tuum & exitum tuum ex hoc & usque in sæculum, Non enim temporis hujus & sæculi est ista custodia, non aduri sole atque luna, & ab omni malo conservari, sed futuri boni expectatio est, cum exeuntes de corpore ad introitum illum regni cœlestis per custodiam Domini fideles omnes reservabuntur, in sinu scilicet interim Abrahamæ collocati; quo adire impios interjectum Chaos inhibet, quousque introeundi rursus in regnum cœlorum tempus adveniat. Custodit ergo Dominus exitum, dum de corpore exeuntes secreti ab impiis interjecto Chaos quiescunt. Custodit & introitum, dum nos in æternum illud & beatum regnum introducit. *Ans. at the end of the 2. Psalm*, Iudicii enim dies vel beatitudinis retributio est æterna vel pœnæ: tempus vero mortis habet unumquemque suis legibus, dum ad iudicium unumquemque aut Abrahamæ reservat aut pœna. Thus Gregory Nyssen still leaves the Patriarchs in Abraham's bosom, in expectation of admittance into heaven, καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ πατρίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰδὲν τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὴν ἐπιούσαντες, καὶ ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐπιζητούντες τὴν ἐπαράμιον παρίδα καὶ δόξαν οὖν ὁ Ἀποστόλος· ὅτι ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν χάριν ἦσαν, τῷ Θεῷ κρείττονος καὶ ἡμῶν προβλεψαμένους, καὶ τὴν τῷ Παύλῳ φωνὴν, ἵνα μὴ, φησὶ, χωρὶς ἡμῶν τησώσῃσι. *De Hominis Opificio, cap. 22.* These therefore which conceived that the souls of the godly now after Christs ascension do goe unto the bosom of Abraham, where the Patriarchs and Prophets were and are, and that both remain together till the generall Resurrection, did not believe that Christ did therefore descend into hell that he might translate the Patriarchs from thence into heaven.

But such as thought the place in which the soules of the Patriarchs did reside could not in propriety of speech be called Hell, nor was ever so named in the Scriptures, conceived, that as our Saviour went to those who were included in the proper Hell, or place of torment, so the end of his Descent was to deliver soules from those miseries which they felt, and to translate them to a place of hap-

† S. Augustine
in his book de
Hæresibus rec-
tione tris as the

happinesse and a glorious condition: They which did think that Hell was wholly emptied, that every soul was presently released from all the pains which before it suffered, were branded with the names of † Hereticks; but to believe that many were delivered, was both by them and many others counted Orthodox.

The
seventy ninth Heresie. Alia, descendente ad Inferos Christo credidisse incredulos, & omnes inde eximam liberatos. And though he gives the Heresy without a name as he found it in Philastrius, yet we find the opinion was not very singular. For Euodius propounded it to S. Augustine, as a question in which he desired satisfaction, an descendens Christus omnibus evangelizavit, omnesque à tenebris & penis per gratiam liberavit, ut à tempore resurrectionis Domini iudicium expectetur exanimatis inferis. And in his answer to that question, he looks not upon the affirmative part as an Heresie, but as a doubtfull proposition. His resolution on this is, that it did not concern the Prophets and the Patriarchs, because he could not see how they should be thought to be in Hell, and so capable of a deliverance from thence. Addunt quidam hoc beneficium antiquis etiam sanctis fuisse concessum, Abel, Seth, Noe, & domui ejus, Isaac, & Jacob, aliisque Patriarchis & Prophetis, ut cum Dominus in infernum venisset, illis doloribus solverentur. Sed quonam modo intelligatur Abraham, in cujus sinum pius etiam pauper ille susceptus est, in illis fuisse doloribus, ego quidem non video: explicant fortasse qui possunt, Epist. 99. ad Euodium: & paulo post, Unde illis iustis qui in sinu Abraham erant, cum ille in inferna descenderet, nondum quid contulisset inveni, à quibus cum secundum beatificam præsentiam suæ divinitatis nunquam video recessisse. And yet in another place he will not blame them that believed the contrary, nor did he think their opinion absurd. Si enim non absurde credi videtur, antiquos etiam sanctos qui venturi Christi tenuerunt fidem, locis quidem à tormentis impiorum remotissimis sed apud inferos fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi & ad eam loca descensus erueret, &c. De Civit. Dei, l. 20. c. 31. His second Resolution was, that Christ did by his descent relieve some out of the paines of hell, taking hell in the most sense. Quia evidentia testimonia & infernum commemorant & dolores, nulla causa occurrit cur illuc credatur venisse salvator, nisi ut ab ejus doloribus saltem faceret, Epist. 99. Quamobrem teneamus firmissime, quod fides habet fundatissima auctoritate firmata, quia Christus mortuus est secundum scripturas & quia sepultus est, & quia resurrexit tertio die secundum scripturas; & cetera quæ de illo, testante veritate, conscripta sunt, in quibus etiam hoc est, quod apud inferos fuit solutis eorum doloribus, quibus cum erat impossibile teneri; à quibus etiam recte intelligitur solvisse & liberasse quos voluit, Ibid. His third Resolution was, that how many these were which were delivered out of the torments of Hell was uncertain, and therefore temerarious to define. Sed utrum omnes quos in eis invenit, an quosdam quos illo beneficio dignos judicavit, adhuc requirō, Ibid. Hoc scilicet quod scriptum est, Solvatis doloribus inferni, non in omnibus, sed in quibusdam

nam accipi potest, quos ille dignos ista liberatione iudicabat; ut neque frustra illic descendisse existimeretur, nulli eorum profuturus qui ibi tenebantur inclusi; nec tamen sit consequens, ut quod Divina quibusdam misericordia iustitiaque concessit, omnibus concessum esse putandum sit; *Ibid.* Potest & sic ut eos dolores eum solvisse credamus, quibus teneri ipse non poterat, sed quibus alii tenebantur quos ille noverat liberandos. Verum quoniam isti sunt temerarii est definire. Si enim omnes omnino dixerimus tunc esse liberatos qui illic inventi sunt, quis non graveretur si hoc possimus ostendere? *Ibid.* Thus the opinion of S. Augustine is clear, that those which departed in the faith of Christ were before in happiness, and the beatificall presence of God, and so needed not translation by the descent of Christ; and of those which were kept in the pains of Hell, some were loosed and delivered from them, some were not, and this was the proper end or effect of Christs Descent into Hell. Thus Capreolus, Ipse in homine est visitare inferorum dignatus abstrusa, & præpositos mortis præsentia invictæ majestatis exterruit, & propter liberandos quos voluit inferorum portas referari præcepit, *Epist. ad Hispanos.* And S. Ambrose, Ipse autem inter mortuos liber remissionem in inferno positis soluta mortis lege donabat, *De Incarnat. c. p. 5.* Ὅλον δ' εὐθύς σκυλεύσας τὸν ᾄδων, καὶ τὰς ἀφ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς κακομνησθῶν πνεύμασιν ἀναπετάσας πύλας, ἐρημόν τε καὶ μόνον ἀφ' οὗτοι ἰδὼν διὰ βολὸν ἀνέστη, S. Cyril. *Homil. Pasch. 7.* It so speaks ju'l as high as those words of Euodius, or that Heretick whosoever it was, which is mentioned though not named by Philastrius. For ἐρημὸν καὶ μόνον διὰ βολὸν, is as much as Inferi exinaniti; and ἀναπετάσας τὸν θάνατον μυχόν (wh. ch. he useth in another Homily) is the same.

The means by which they did conceive that Christ did free the soules of men from hell, was the application of his death unto them, which was propounded to thole soules by preaching of the Gospel there. That as he revealed here on earth the will of God unto the sonnes of men, and propounded himself as the object of their faith, to the end that whosoever believed in him should never dye; so after his death he shewed himself unto the soules departed, that whosoever of them would yet accept of and acknowledge him, should passe from death to life.

† This preaching of the Gospel to the dead was the general opinion of the Fathers, as the end of his descent, or means by which that good was

Thus

wrought for the soules below, which was effected by his death. Ea propter Dominum in ea quæ sub terra descendisse evangelizantem & illis adventum suum, remissionem peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum. Crediderunt autem in eum omnes qui sperabant in eum, id est, qui adventum ejus prænuñciaverunt, & dispositionibus ejus servierunt, justis & Prophetis & Patriarchis, quibus similiter nobis remisit peccata, Irenæus, l. 4. c. 45. Εἰσρχοῦν δ' οἶμαι καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ, ἵνα ἵδῃ τὸ σωζέμενον ἔργον αὐτῶν. ὅτε οὐκ καὶ πεποιήκειν τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεῦσαι βαβε-

λημνύς διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος, ὅποι ποτ' ἐπύχον μαρτύρες, ἐκλύσας οἷς συνέ-
 αν. Εἰ γ' οὖν ὁ Κύριος δι' ἐλπίν ἐπερὶ οἷς ἔδωκε κατ' ἡλθιν, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελί-
 αῖσάσαι, ὡς κατ' ἡλθιν, ἢ τοὺς πάντας εὐαγγελίσασθαι ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους. Εἰ
 μὲν οὖν πάντας, συνήθον ἦ πάντες οἱ πνεύματος, καὶ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῶν ὄντες πύλαι,
 ὅμοιοι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἢ καὶ, Clem. Alexand. Stromat. l. 6. Τελούμενος ὁ ἀπο-
 βίω κηρύξας καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι. Πληρεστέλης ὁ ἔργος ἢ τὸ φιλανθρωπίας
 ἐπίδειξις ἦν, πρὸς μὴ μόνον ἀναστῶσαι, φησὶ, τοῦ ἐτι ζώντος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ὅ-
 λα καὶ τοῖς ἡδὴ κατοιχομένοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡσυχαστικῶν καθεμένοις ἐν σκότει,
 καὶ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι διακηρύξαι τὴν ἀφασιν, S. Cyril. in Johan. l. 12. Πολλὰ γὰρ
 διαμυρῆσαι ἢ ῥαφή, ὅν τρόπον τοῖς πνεύματι ζῶσι τὸ αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ
 Χριστῷ πᾶσι ἀπολύθωσιν πνεύματι. Λέγει ὁ ὅτι μαθητῶν κορυφαῖος, οἷς ἡ-
 το ὁ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. καὶ πάλιν, τοῖς ἐν φυ-
 λακῇ πορεύεσθαι ἐκήρυξε πνεύματι, ἵνα κηρύξῃ μὴ σαρὰ, ζῶσι τὸ πνεύματι
 τελέσιν, ὅπως οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτῶν, μεμνηκότες κατακρί-
 σιν, ὅτε δι' ὁλοκλήρως σάρεξ μαρτύρες, καὶ δι' ὁλοκλήρως τὸ πνεύματι,
 ὅσοι καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ Χριστῷ τῇ δικαιοσυνῇ πιστεύουσιν, τῆς πνευματικῆς σω-
 τῆς ἀπολαύσιν, Jobius apud Photium, lib. 2. cap. 38.

Thus did they think the soul of Christ descended into Hell to preach the Gospell to the spirits there, that they might receive him who before believed in him, or that they might believe in him who before rejected him. But this cannot be received as the end, or way to effect the end of Christs descent; nor can I look upon it as any illustration of this Article, for many reasons. For first, I have already shew'd that the place of S. Peter so often mentioned for it, is not capable of that sense, nor hath it any relation to our Saviour after death. Secondly, the Ancients seem upon no other reason to have interpreted this place of S. Peter in that manner, but because other Apochryphal writings led them to that interpretation, upon the authority whereof this opinion onely can rely. A place of the Prophet Jeremy was first produced, that *The Lord God of Israel remembred his dead, which slept in the land of the grove, and descended unto them to preach unto them his salvation.*

† Justine Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Kal ἀπὸ τοῦ

λέγοντος αὐτοῦ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ὁμοίως ταῦτα φησὶν, Ἐμνήθη ὁ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ κακοιμημένων οἰς γῆν χάματι, καὶ κατ' ἡλθιν αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ. This place is first brought by Irenaeus to prove that he which dyed for us was not onely man but God. Ex quoniam

non solum homo erat qui moriebatur pro nobis, Esaias ait, Et commemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum quia (lege qui) dormierant in terra sepulchris, & descendit ad eos et evangelizare salutem quam est ab eo, ut salvaret eos. Adv. Hæres. l. 3. 23. *Onely he names Esaias instead of Jeremias, whom he rightly names again, l. 4. 39. Sicut Hieremias ait, Re commemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israel mortuorum, &c. and as there, so more plainly, l. 5. c. 26. applies it to the soul of Christ while it was absent from his body, Nunc autem tribus diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui, quemadmodum Prophetia ait de eo, Commemoratus est Dominus Sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, eorum qui ante dormierant in terra stipulationis (lege sepulchris) & descendit ad eos extrahere eos, & salvare eos.* Thus did Irenæus make use of this verse, to shew Christ preached unto the dead, rather than that of S. Peter; and yet there is no authority in it. For it is not to be found in the Hebrew Text, and Irenæus charges the Jewes onely of raising it out of the LXX, which how they could doe out of those Copies which were in the Christians hands is not intelligible; and yet it is not now to be found there. And if it ever were, as many additions all patches have bin in that Translation, it could be of no authority having no foundation in the Originall.

But being there is no such verse extant in that Prophet or any other, it was also delivered that it was once in the translation of the Septuagint, but rased out from thence by the Jewes; which as it can scarce be conceived true, so if it were, it would be yet of no authority, as being never found in the Hebrew Text. And *Hermes* in his book called the *Pastor*, was *thought to give sufficient strength * *Clemens A.* to this opinion, whereas the book it self is of no authority, *Alexandrinus* and in this particular is most extravagant; for he taught first brings a that not onely the soul of Christ, but also the soules of the strange place of Apostles preached to the spirits below, that as they followed Scripture to prove Christs preaching in

Hell, *Stromat. l. 6. Διδασκὶς Κύριος ἐν ὕψιστοις καὶ τοῖς ἐν ᾧ σου. Φησὶ γὰρ ἡ γραφή, Λέγει ὁ ᾄδης τῇ ἀπολλίᾳ, Εἶδος αὐτῆς ἐκείνης, φωνὴν δὲ αὐτῆς ἀκούσας. which he thus interprets, ἕχ ὁ τόπος ὃν περὶ φωνῆς λαβὼν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ οἱ ἐν ᾧ σου κατὰ πνεῦμα καὶ οἱ ἀπολλίαν αὐτῆς ἐκείνης ἀκούσας καὶ τὴν φωνὴν οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ οἱ ἀπολλίαν αὐτῆς ἐκείνης ἀκούσαντες. αὐτοὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι οἱ ἐπακούσαντες & δεῖας δωρεῶν καὶ φωνῆς and then seeming to aim at the words of S. Peter, he passes to another proof which he had produced in his second book, Διδασκὶς γὰρ καὶ τῷ δαδῆρῳ ἑξῆς μαρτυρεῖ τὸς Ἀποστόλους ἀκούοντας τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τὸν ᾄδον ἐν ὕψιστοις. which he there proved by the authority of the book called *Pastor*, and attributed to *Hermes*. Ὁ Ἑρμῆς δὲ... φησὶ τὸς Ἀποστόλους καὶ τοῖς διδασκάλους, τὸς κηρύξαντας τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κοιμῶντας τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι κηρύξαντες τοῖς περὶ κακοιμῶντοισι, *Strom. l. 12. and supplies that**

that authority with a reason of his own, that as the Apostles were to imitate Christ while they lived, so did they also imitate him after death, ΕΧΩΝ 38, ὅτι καὶ πάντων αὐτῶν, ὅτι καὶ καὶ οὖν, τὰς ἀπίστους ἐκ μανητῶν μυντὰς ἡνδὶς τῷ δὶδου-
σκάλῳ, Stromat. l. 6. and therefore they preached to the soules in hell, as Christ did before them. This is the doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus out of his Apocryphal authorities.

lowed his steps here, so did they also after their death, and therefore descended to preach in Hell. Nor is this onely to be suspected in reference to those pretended authorities which first induced men to believe it, and to make forced interpretations of Scripture to maintain it; but also to be rejected in it self, as false and inconsistent with the nature, scope, and end of the Gospel (which is to be preached with such commands and ordinances as can concern those onely which are in this life) and as incongruous to the state and condition of those soules to whom Christ is supposed to preach. For if we look upon the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all Saints before departed, 'tis certain they were never *disobedient in the dayes of Noah*, nor could they need the publication of the Gospel after the death of Christ, who by vertue of that death were accepted in him while they lived, and by that acceptation had receiv'd a reward long before. If we look upon them which dyed in disobedience, and were in torments for their finnes, they cannot appear to be proper objects for the Gospel preach'd. The rich man whom we find in their condition, desired one might be sent from the dead to preach unto his brethren then alive, least they also should come unto that place: but we find no hopes he had that any should come from them which were alive to preach to him. For if the living, who *hear'd not Moses and the Prophets*, would *not be perswaded though one rose from the dead*, surely those which had bin disobedient unto the Prophets, should never be perswaded after they were dead. Whether therefore we consider the Authorities first introducing this opinion, which were Apocryphal; or the testimonies of Scripture,

Luke 16. 31.

forth

fore'd and improbable; or the nature of this preaching, inconsistent with the Gospel; or the persons to whom Christ should be thought to preach, which if dead in the faith and fear of God, wanted no such instruction, if departed in infidelity and disobedience, were unworthy and incapable of such a dispensation, this preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison cannot be admitted either as the end, or as the means proper to effect the end of his descent into Hell.

Nor is this Preaching onely to be rejected as a means to produce the effect of Christs Descent; but the effect it self pretended to be wrought thereby, whether in reference to the just or unjust, is by no means to be admitted. For though some of the Ancients thought, as is shew'n before, that Christ did therefore descend into hell that he might deliver the soules of some which were tormented in those flames, and translate them to a place of happinesse; yet this opinion deserveth no acceptance, neither in respect of the ground or foundation on which 'tis built, nor in respect of the Action or Effect it self. The Authority upon which the strength of this doctrine doth rely, is that place of the Acts, *whom God hath raised up loosing the pains of hell*, for so they read it: from whence the Argument is thus deduced, God did loose the paines of hell, when Christ was raised: but those paines did not take hold of Christ himself, who was not to suffer any thing after death; and consequently he could not be loosed from, or taken out of those paines, in which he never was. In the same manner the Patriarchs and the Prophets and the Saints of Old, if they should be granted to have bin in a place sometimes called Hell, yet were they there in happinesse, and therefore the delivering them from thence could not be the loosing of the paines of hell. It followeth then, that those alone which dyed in their sinnes were involved in those paines, and when those paines were loosed then were they released; and being they were loosed when Christ

was raised, the consequence will be, that he descending into hell, delivered some of the damned soules from their torments there.

† The *Vulgar*
Latinerendret
it thus, Quem
Deus suscita-
vit, solutis dol-
oribus infer-
ni: so also the
Syriack, וְשׁוּא
חַבְלוֹ וְשׁוּא:
So some of the
ancient Fathers
read it, as Ire-
naeus l. 3. c. 12.
or rather his In-
terpreter, Quē
Deus excitavit

† The *Vulgar* Latine rendereth it thus, *Quem Deus suscitavit, solus doloribus inferni*: so also the Syriack; *ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ*: So some of the ancient Fathers read it, as Irenæus l. 3. c. 12. or rather his Interpreter. *Quæ*

solutis doloribus inferorum, Capreolus-Bishop of Carthage, Resolvere, sicut scriptum est, inferorum parturitiones: *And before these Polycarpus, δι' ἡμετέρας* Θεός λύσας τὰς ἀδύνας τοῦ αἵματος, Quem resuscitavit Deus dissolvens dolores inferni, *Epist. ad Philip. whom I suppose Grotius understood when he cited Barnabas and thus S. Augustine read it, & laid the stress of his Interpretation upon this reading, Quia evidētia testimonia & internum commemorant & dolores, &c. But in the Originall Greek it is generally written ἀδύνας δαυμάτων, and in all these many Copies of it, onely that of Pœrus Fraxardus, and 2. of the 16. Copies which Robertus Stephanus made use of, read it αἵματος and this mistake was very easie; for in the eighteenth Psalm, verse the 5. there is חַבְלוֹ מוֹת, ἀδύνας δαυμάτων, and verse the fixth חַבְלוֹ שְׁאוֹל, ἀδύνας αἵματος.* * Quod si movere aliquis

fixi שוהו שוהו, שוהו שוהו. * Quod si mover aliquem quemadmodum accipiendum sit Inferni ab illo solutos dolores. Neque enim temperat in eis esse tanquam in vinculis, & sic eos solvit tanquam si carenis solvisset quibus fuerat alligatus; facile est intelligere sic eos solutos, quemadmodum solvi possunt laquei venantium, ne teneant, non quia tenuerunt, S. Aug. *Epist.* 99.

Again, as the Authority is most uncertain, so is the Doctrine most incongruous. The soules of men were never cast into infernall torments to be delivered from them. The dayes which follow after death were never made for opportunities to a better life. The Angels had one instant either to stand or fall eternally; and what that instant was

to them, that this life is unto us. We may as well believe the Devils were sav'd, as those soules which were once tormented with them. For it is an *everlasting fire*, an *everlasting punishment*, a *worm* that *dyeth not*. Nor does this onely belong to us who live after the death of Christ, as if the damnation of all sinners now were ineluctable and eternall, but before that death it were not so; as if faith and repentance were now indispensably necessary to salvation, but then were not. For thus the condition of mankind, before the fulnesse of time in which our Saviour came into the world, should have bin farre more happy and advantagious then it hath bin since. But neither they nor we shall ever escape eternall flames, except we obtain the favour of God before we be swallowed by the

Mar. 25. 41, 46.

Mar. 9. 44.

† *This is the Argument of Gregory the Great, Si fideles nunc sine operibus bonis*

non salvantur, & infideles ac reprobī, sine bona actione, Domino ad Inferos descendente, salvati sunt; melior illorum fors fuit qui incarnationem Domini minime viderunt, quam horum qui post incarnationis ejus mysterium nati sunt. Quod quantæ fatuitatis sit dicere, ipse Dominus testatur discipulis dicens, *Multi Regis & Prophetæ voluerunt videre quæ vos videtis, & non viderunt*, l. 6. Epist. 179.

jawes of death. *We must all appear before the judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body*: but if they be in the state of salvation now by virtue of Christs descent into hell which were numbred amongst the damned before his death, at the day of the generall judgement they must be returned into hell again; or if they be received then into eternall happinesse, it will follow either that they were not justly condemned to those flames at first, according to the generall dispensations of God, or else they did not receive the things done in their body at the last; which all shall as certainly receive, as all appear. This life is given unto men to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, but after death cometh judgement, reflecting on the life that's past, not expecting amendment or conversion then. He that liveth and believeth in Christ shall never dye; he that believeth though

though he dye, yet shall he live; but he that dyeth in unbelief shall neither believe nor live. And this is as true of those which went before as of those which came after our Saviour, because he was the lamb slain before the foundations of the world. I therefore conclude, that the end for which the soul of Christ descended into Hell, was not to deliver any damned soules, or to translate them from the torments of hell unto the joyes of heaven.

The next consideration is, whether by vertue of his descent the soules of those which before believed in him, the Patriarchs, Prophets, and all the people of God, were delivered from that place and state in which they were before, and whether Christ *descended into Hell* to that end, that he might translate them into a place & state far more glorious and happy. This hath bin in the later ages of the Church the vulgar opinion of most men, and that as if it followed necessarily from the deniall of the former; He delivered not the soules of the damned, † therefore he delivered the soules of them which believed, and of them alone. Till at the last the Schools have followed it so fully, that they deliver it as a point of * faith and infallible certainty, that the soul of Christ by descending into hell did deliver from thence all the soules of the Saints which were in the bosome of *Abraham*, and did conferre upon them actuall and essentiall beatitude, which before they enjoyed not. And this they lay upon two grounds; first,

† So Gregory the Great, after he had proved that none of the damned were released by Christs descent, thus inferres & concludes, Hæc itaque omnia pertractantes, nihil aliud re-

neatis, nisi quod vera fides per Catholicam Ecclesiam docet; quia descendens ad Inferos Dominus illos solummodo ab inferni claustris eripuit, quos viventes in carne per suam gratiam, in fide & bona operatione servavit, l. 6. Epist. 179. So Isidore Hispalensis by way of opposition, Ideo Dominus in inferno descendit ut his qui ab eo non pœnaliter detinebantur, viam aperiret revertendi ad cœlos. So Venerable Bede upon the place of S. Peter, Catholica fides habet quia descendens ad inferna Dominus non incredulos inde, sed fideles tantummodo suos educens ad cœlestia secum regna perduxerit; neque ex utero corpore animabus & interiorum carcere inclusis, sed in hac vita vel per seipsum, vel per suorum exemplum vive verba fidelium quotidie viam vitæ demonstrat.

These are the words of Suarez in 3^{am} Thomæ Disputat. 43. Sect. 3. Primo ergo, certum est Christum descen-

descendendo ad Inferos animabus sanctis, quæ in sinu Abraham erant, essentialem beatitudinem & cætera animæ dona, quæ illam consequuntur, contulisse. Hoc de fide certum existimo; quia de fide est illas animas non vidisse Deum ante Christi mortem. 2. inde est de fide certum, Christum per mortem aperuisse hominibus januam regni: ideoque de fide etiam certum est, animas Sanctorum omnium post Christi mortem decedentium (si nihil purgandum habeant) statim videre Deum. Ergo idem est de prædictis animabus.

that the Soules of Saints departed saw not God; and secondly, that Christ by his death opened the gate of the Kingdom of heaven. But even this opinion, as generall as it hath bin, hath neither that consent of Antiquity, nor such certainty as it pretendeth, but is rather built upon the improbabilities of a worse. The † most ancient of all the Fathers, whose writings are extant, were so farre from believing that the end of Christs descent into hell was to translate the Saints of old into heaven, that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christs death, untill the generall resurrection. Others, as we have also shewen, thought the bosome of *Abraham* was not in any place, which could be termed Hell; and consequently could not think that Christ should therefore descend into Hell to deliver them which were not there. And others yet which thought that Christ delivered the Patriarchs from their infernall mansions, did not think so exclusively, or in opposition to the disobedient and damned spirits, but conceived many of them to be sav'd as well as the Patriarchs were, and * doubted whether all were not so sav'd or no. Indeed I think there were very few (if any) for above 500 yeares after Christ, which did so believe Christ delivered the Saints out of Hell, as to leave all the damned there; and therefore this opinion cannot be grounded upon the prime antiquity, when so many of the Ancients believed not that they were remov'd at all, and so few acknowledged that they were remov'd alone. And

† We have shew'd this before to have bin the opinion of the most ancient, producing the expresse testimonies of *Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen.* So also *Novatian l. de Trinitate*, viz infra terram jacent, neque ipsa sunt digestis & ordinatis poterantibus vacua. Locus enim est quo piorum animæ impiorumque durantur, futuri judicii præjudicia sentientes.

* We have already shew'd that many did believe all the damned soules were saved thereof. S. Augustine had his adhuc requiro, when he wrote to *Enodius* concerning this opinion. Beside the doubt of that great Divine, *Gregory Nazanzene*, is very

observable, where his Oration de Paschæ hath these words, "Αν οἱ ὁ δαμνῶν
 οὐρανῶν; τίς ὁ λόγος; ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν ἐμπνοῶν, ἡμεῖς οὐδ' ἐκ τῶν
 οὐρανῶν; Where his question is clearly this, whether Christ appearing in hell, did save all
 without exception, or did save there, as he does here, only such as believed. To this
 it is answered by Suarez two ways, that it is the ordinary and universall law, that none
 of the damned should be saved, An vero ex speciali privilegio sua voluntate & mo-
 ditio aliquem damnatum ex Gehenna Christus eduxerit, dubitari quoque mo-
 do potest. . . . Et junctæ hæc possent intelligi Nazianzenus & Augustinus. But
 this will by no means save their authorities; for neither of them did doubt or quæstion
 whether some of the damned were released, but whether all were released or some only;
 which Suarez did very well perceive, and therefore was ready in the same sentence
 with another answer, Quamquam Nazianzenus non videatur illa scripsisse verba,
 quoniam de hac veritate dubitaret, sed solum ut proponeret quid de hoc myste-
 rio inquirere ac scire oporteat. which is as much as to say, that He was satisfied of
 the truth, but desired to satisfy no man else. Whereas 'tis clear that it was a doubt in
 his age, as we have before shew'd, and that he would leave it still a doubt and undeter-
 mined. And as for the other, Augustinus recte potest intelligi de animabus Purga-
 torii, it is certainly false, unless they will enlarge that Purgatory as wide as Hell; for
 the question was of emptying that.

And if the Authority of this opinion in respect of it's an-
 tiquity be not great, the certainty of the truth of it will
 be lesse. For first, if it be not certain that the soules of the
 Patriarchs were in some place called *hell* after their own
 death, and untill the death of Christ; if the bosome of
Abraham were not some infernall mansion; then can it
 not be certain that Christ descended into hell to deliver
 them. But there is no certainty that the soules of the just,
 the Patriarchs and the rest of the people of God were kept
 in any place below, which was, or may be called Hell:
 the bosome of *Abraham* might well be in the heavens a-
 bove, farre from any region where the Devil and his An-
 gells were; the Scriptures nowhere tell us that the spi-
 rits of just men went unto, or did remain in hell; the place
 in which the Rich man was in torments after death is cal-
 led *hell*, but that into which the Angells carried the poor
 mans soul is not termed so. There was a vast distance be-
 tween them two; nor is it likely that the Angells which
 see the face of God should be sent down from hea-

ven to convey the soules of the just into that place where the face of God cannot be seen. When God translated *Enoch*, and *Elias* was carried up in a chariot to heaven, they seem not to be conveyed to a place where there was no vision of God; and yet it is most probable, that *Moses* was with *Elias* as well before as upon the Mount: nor is there any reason to conceive that *Abram* should be in any worse place or condition then *Enoch* was, having as great a *testimonie that he pleased God*, as *Enoch* had.

Secondly, it cannot be certain that the Soul of Christ delivered the Soules of the Saints of old from Hell, and imparted to them the beatificall vision, except it were certain that those soules are in another place and a better condition now then they were before. But there is no certainty that the Patriarchs and the Prophets are now in another place and a better condition then they were before our blessed Saviour dyed; there is no intimation of any such alteration of their state delivered in the Scriptures: there is no such place with any probability pretended to prove any actuall accession of happinesse and glory already past. *Many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven*; there then did the Gentiles which came in to Christ find the Patriarchs, even in the Kingdom of heaven; and we cannot perceive that they found them any where else then *Lazarus* did. For the description is the same, *There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the Prophets in the Kingdom of God, and you your selves thrust out*. For as the Rich man in hell lift up his eyes being in torments, and see the *Abraham* as farre off, before the death of Christ; so those that were in weeping and gnashing of teeth, saw *Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob* and the Prophets when the Gentiles were brought in.

Mat. 8. 11.

Luke 13. 28.

Thirdly, though it were certain that the soules of the

Saints had bin in a place called Hell, as they were not; though it were also certain that they were now in a better condition: then they were before Christs death, as it is not; yet it would not follow that Christ descended into Hell to make this alteration; for it might not be performed before his Resurrection, it might not be effected till his Ascension, it might be attributed to the merit of his passion, it might have no dependance on his descension. I conclude therefore that there is no certainty of truth in that Proposition on which the Schoolmen take for a matter of faith, That Christ delivered the soules of the Saints from that place of Hell which they call *Limbus* of the Fathers, into heaven; and for that purpose after his death descended into Hell.

Wherefore being it is most infallibly certain that the death of Christ was as powerfull and effectually for the Redemption of the Saints before him, as for those which follow him; being *they did all eat the same spirituall meat, and did all drink the same spirituall drink*; being *Abraham* is the Father of us all; and we now after Christs Ascension are called but *to walk in the steps of the faith of that Father*; being the bosome of *Abraham* is clearly propounded in the Scriptures as the place into which the blessed Angels before the death of Christ convey'd the soules of those which departed in the favour of God, and is also † promised to them which should believe in Christ after his death; being we can find no difference or translation of the bosome of *Abraham*, and yet it is a

† Although the Bosome of Abraham in express and formal termes be

spoke onely of Lazarus, whom Christ being yet alive in the flesh supposed dead; yet the same Bosome is virtually and in termes equivalent promised to those which afterwards should believe. For the joyes of the life to come are likened to a Feast, in which according to the custome then in use, they lay down with the head of one toward the breast of the other, who is therefore said to lie in his bosome, as we read of S. John, *ἐν ἀγαπῇ* ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ. *Ἰησοῦ* : us in that heavenly Feast in the Kingdom of God. Lazarus is *ἀνακειμένῳ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ* *Ἀβραάμ*. And in the same Chap. Christ saith, that Many shall come from the East and from the West, *καὶ ἀνακεῖσθαι μετὰ Ἀβραάμ*, discurrent cum Abrahamo, sit down with Abraham, as we translate it after our custome, at the same feast, that is, *ἀνακεῖσθαι μετὰ*

τὸ ἄβραμ τὸ Ἀβραάμ, &c. as Euthymius, Quia Deus Abraham, cœli conditor, Pater Christi est; ideo in regno cœlorum est & Abraham, cum quo accubijunt functiones, quæ crediderunt in Christum filium creatoris.

comfort still * to us that we shall goe to him, and while we hope so never fear that we shall go to hell; I cannot admit this as the end of Christs descent into hell, to convey the soules of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, and those which were with them, from thence; nor can I think there was any reference to such an action in those words, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell.*

* S. Augustine often shewes the comfort which he had in going to the bosome of Abraham: As in the case of his friend Nebridius, Nunc ille

vixit in sinu Abraham. Quicquid illud est quod illo significatur sinu, ibi Nebridius meus vivit, dulcis amicus meus, tuus autem Domine, adoptivus ex liberto filius ibi vivit. Nam quis alius tali animæ locus? *Confess. l. 9. c. 3. And he seats his place (as uncer ain as befo e) where it was before.* Post vitam istam parvam nondum eris ubi erunt Sancti, quibus dicetur, *Ve. ite benedicti Patri, percipite regnum quod vobis paratum est ab initio mundi.* Nondum ibi eris, quis nescit? Sed jam poteris ibi esse ubi illum quondam ulcerosum pauperem dives ille superbus & sterilis in mediis suis tormentis vidit à longe requiescentem. *Concio 1. in Psal. 36. And sh: he must necessarily take for a sufficient comfort to a dying Christian, who seats that place in conspectu Domini, de Civ. Dei l. 1. c. 12. and looked upon them which were in it, & upon those à quibus Christus secundum beatificam præsentiam nunquam recessit, Epist. 99.*

Another opinion hath obtained; especially in our Church, that the end for which our Saviour descended into Hell, was to triumph over Satan and all the powers below within their own dominions. And this hath bin received as grounded on the Scriptures and consent of Fathers. The Scriptures produced for the confirmation of it are these two, *Having spoyled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them: And, When he ascended upon high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.* Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? By the conjunction of these two they conceive the triumph of Christs descent clearly described in this manner. Ye were buried with Christ in baptism, with whom ye were

Col. 2. 15.

Eph. 4. 8, 9.

B. Bilson

p. 294.

Col. 2. 12, 13,

14, 15.

also raised; and when ye were dead in sinnes, he quickned you together with him, forgiving your sinnes, and cancelling the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, & spoiling powers and principalities, he made an open shew of them, triumphing over them in himself. That is, say they, ye dyed and were buried with Christ, who fastened the hand-writing of ordinances to the Crosse, that he might abolish it, from having any right to tye or yoke his members. Ye likewise were quickned, and raised together with Christ, who rising spoiled powers and principalities, and triumphed over them in his own person. So that these words, *spoiling principalities and powers*, are not referred to the Crosse, but to Christs resurrection. This Triumph over Satan and all his Kingdome, the same Apostle to the *Ephesians* setteth down as a consequent to Christs death, and pertinent to his Resurrection, *Ascending on high he led captivity captive*: and this, *He ascended what meaneth it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?* so that ascending from the lower parts of the earth he led captivity captive, which is all one with he triumphed over powers and principalities. With this coherence and conjunction of the Apostles words, together with the interpretation of the ancient Fathers, they conceive it sufficiently demonstrated, that Christ after his death, and before his Resurrection, in the lowermost parts of the earth, ev'n in hell, did lead captivity captive, and triumphed over Satan.

But notwithstanding, I cannot yet perceive either how this Triumph in hell should be delivered as a certain truth in it self, or how it can have any consistency with the denyall of those other ends, which they who of late have embraced this opinion, do ordinarily reject. First, I cannot see how the Scriptures mentioned are sufficient to found any such conclusion of themselves. Secondly, I cannot understand how they can embrace this as the interpretation of the Fathers, who believe not that any of the soules of the damned

διὰ τὴν ἑλπίαν, Ῥωμαίων, Ἰουδαίων, τὰς δυνάμεις ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν. *And this Exposition they received from S. Chrysostome, who makes the δυνάμεις on the crosse, to consist in the death upon it, Εὐὸ τὴν πλῆρην ἔλαβον ὁ διαβολὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ παρὰ τὴν γῆν λαβόν. Where it is to be observed that the triumph is not attributed to the soule departed from the body and descended into h. ll, but rather to the body left by the soul and hanging on the crosse, διὰ τὴν οὐκ οὐσῶματος πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τὴν καὶ αὐτῇ χάριτος, ὡς ἰνὴν, say, Theodoret And before all these Origen most expressly, Visibiliter quidem Filius Dei in carne crucifixus est, invisibiliter vero in cruce diabolus cum principatibus suis & potestatibus affixus est cruci. Non tibi hoc videbitur verum, si tibi horum testem pr. duxero Apostolum Paulum? Quod erat contrarium nobis, tulit illud de medio affigens cruci suæ, exuens principatus & potestates traduxit libere, triumphans eas in ligno crucis. Ergo duplex Domine crucis est ratio; una illa, qua dicit Petrus quod Christus crucifixus nobis reliquit exemplum & hæc secunda, qua crux illa trophæum Diaboli fuit, in quo & crucifixus est & triumphatus, in Jo. 10. Requievit ut I eo, cum in cruce positus principatus & potestates exuit, & triumphavit eos cum ligno crucis, item.*

† Te. 11. Serpent's spoliū, de victo Principe mundi, Affixit ligno refugiarum immanitudo, hæc.

Prudentius.

Dic trophæum passionis, I. ic triumphalem crucem, Cat. 2.

Hym. 10.

S. Hilary most expressly, *Manus ejus ad dextra*

ad dextra sunt cum vicit sæculum. Ego enim, a. t. vici mundum, cum extentus in crucem invictissimis armis ipsius passionis instruitur. Et 10. 11. inquit, arcum arcum brachia meo, cum de omnibus viribus ac potestatibus in ipso trophæo gloriose crucis triumphat, & principatus & potestates ad dextra cum filio triumphans in semetipso, in Psalm. 143. Where it is observable that the Father does read it in semetipso, and interprets it in e. uce. Nos quoniam trophæum jam videmus, & quod currum suum triumphator ascendit, consideremus quod non arborum, non quadrijugis plaustrum manubias de mortali hoste quæsitæ, sed pulchro triumphali captivæ de sæculo spolia suspendit, S. Amb. 1. 10. in cap. 11. S. Lucæ; and amongst the rest of the captives he reckons afterwards, captivum principem mundi; & spiritalia nequitie quæ sunt in coelestibus. To this allusion

Story, 1 and the triumphall chariot. This place then of S. Paul to the Colossians cannot prove that Christ descended into Hell, to triumph over the Devil there; and if it be not proper for that purpose of it self, it will not be more effectual by the addition of that other to the Ephesians. For first we have already shew'n, that the descending into the lower parts of the earth, doth not necessarily signify his descent into hell, and consequently cannot prove that either those things which are spoken in the same place, or in any other, are to be attributed to that descent. Again, if it were granted, that those words did signifie Hell, and this Article of our Creed were contained in them, yet

would

plus l. 3. ad Thym. Sic oportuit peccatorum nostrorum chirographum deleri, cum vetus homo noster simul cruci affigitur, tanquam in trophæo triumphantis victoria panderetur. *Whe her therfore we read it οὐτως with the Greeks, that it is σωρῶ, or ἐν αὐτῷ with the Latines in seipso, it is the same; for he triumphed over the Devil by himself upon the Crosse as in the same case it is written Eph. 2. 16. ἡ ὑποταγή τοῦ σώματος ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ σωρῶ, ὑποτάσσεται τῇ ἐκέρῃ ἐν αὐτῷ.*

would it not follow from that Scripture, that Christ triumphed over Satan while his soul was in hell; for the consequence would be onely this, that the same Christ who led captivity captive, descended first into Hell. *In that he descended (and ascending led captivity captive) what is it but that he descended first?* the descent then, if it were to hell, did precede the triumphant ascent of the same person, and that is all which the Apostles words will evince. Nay further yet, the Ascent mentioned by S. Paul cannot be that which immediately followed the Descent into Hell, for it evidently signifieth the ascension which followed forty dayes after his Resurrection. It is not an ascent from the parts below to the surface of the earth, but to the heavens above, an *ascending up on high*, even farre above all heavens. Now the *leading captivity captive* belongeth clearly to this ascent, and not to any descent which did precede it. It is not said, that he *descended first to lead captivity captive*; and yet it must be so, if Christ descended into hell to triumph there; it is not said, when he had *led captivity captive*, he *ascended up on high*; for then it might be supposed that the captives had bin led before: But it is expressly said, *ascending up on high he led captivity captive*; and consequently that triumphant act was the immediate effect of his ascension. So that by these two Scriptures no more can be prov'd then this, that Christ triumphed

† The Originall words doe manifestly shew that this triumphant act did not precede

his ascent. For had it bin αἰχμαλωτίζων αἰχμαλώτους ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος, we might have expounded it thus, Christ did lead sinne and death and Satan captive; or he had done so, *ascending up on high*; but being it is written ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος, that is having ascended up on high ἡχμαλωτίζων αἰχμαλώτους, he captivated

wanted a captivity, the Ascent must here precede the captivation, though not in time (as it did the giving of gifts) yet in nature: so that it is not proper to say, by captivizing he ascended; but it is proper to expresse it thus, by ascending he led captive a captivity.

umphed over principalities and powers at his death upon the Crosse, and led captivity captive at his ascension into heaven. Which is so farre from proving that Christ descended into hell to triumph there, that it is more proper to perswade the contrary. For why should he goe to hell to triumph over them, over whom he had triumphed on the crosse? why should he goe to captive that captivity then, which he was to captivate when he ascended into heaven?

As for the testimonies of the Fathers, they will appear of small validity to confirm this triumphant Descent as it is distinguished from the two former effects, the removall of the Saints to heaven, & the delivering the damned from the torments of hell. In vain shall we pretend that Christ descended into Hell to lead captivity captive, if we withall maintain, that when he descended thither he brought none away which were captive there. This was the very

†So S. Hierome *on that place of the Ephesians, Interiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut Sanctorum a-*

notion which † those Fathers had, that the soules of men were conquered by Satan; and after death actually brought into captivity, and that the soul of Christ descending to the place where they were, did actually release them from that bondage, and bring them out of the possession of the Devil by force. Thus did he conquer Satan, spoil Hell, and lead captivity captive, according to their apprehension. But if he had taken no soules from thence, he had

animas quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad cælos victor abduceret. And as Mar. 12. 29. Alligatus est fortis, & religatus in Tartarum, & Domini contritus pede; & direptis sedibus Tyranni, captiva ducta est captivitas. So Arnoldus Carnotensis is to be understood, De Unctione Chrismati, Passus est rex illudi, & vincit occidi, descendensque ad inferos, captivam ab antiquo capivitatem reduxit, applying it to the custome of the Church, Omnino convenit, ut eo tempore quo Christus captivos eduxit ab inferis, reconciliati peccatores ad Ecclesiam reducantur, Ibid.

That Athanasius when he speaks of Christ's triumphing over Satan in Hell, he mentio-
 neth *ἡ ᾗδου στυγερὰ θύρα*, hell spoiled, to wit, of those soules which befo e it kept in
 hold. O herwise in the same Oration in Passionem & crucem, he acknowledge the
 Triumph on the Crosse, *Ἐδεῖ γὰρ νικητὴν τὸ θριαμβεύοντα* (not *θριαμβεύοντα*)
ἐπὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, μὴ ἀπὸ συσχυροῦν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θανάτου. Thus Leo
 the Emperour, *Χειρὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν ᾗδου αἰχμαλωτίζει, καὶ τοῖς αἰχμαλώταις*
ἑωσθῆσαν κηρύσσει, Hom. de Resur. And Ibas Macarius supposeth Christ victo-
 riously speaking, unto hell and death, *Κελεύω σοι ᾗδου καὶ θάνατε, καὶ θάνατε*
ἐν τῇ ἐκκαθάρσει φυχῶν. Author libelli de Paschate, under the name of S. Am-
 brose, *Expers peccati Christus cum ad Tartari ima descenderet, seias inferni ja-*
nuæque confringens, vincias peccato animas, mortis dominatione destructa, è
diaboli faucibus revocavit ad vitam. Atque ita divinum triumphum æternis cha-
 racteribus est conscriptum, dum dicit, *Ubi est, Mors, aculeus tuus? Ubi est, Mors,*
victoria tua? Cap. 4. And the Commentaries under the same name, Gratia Dei ab-
 undavit in descensu Salvatoris, omnibus dans indulgentiam, cum triumpho
 sublevis eis in cœlum, Ad Rom. 5. 14. Secundum animam descendit ad inferna &
 solavit principes tenebrarum ab animabus electorum, *Leber.* Serm. 9. contra
 Cuharos. Thus still the Fathers which speak of spoiling hell, of leading captivity cap-
 tive, of triumphing over Satan in his own quarters, are to be understood in respect
 of those soules which they thought were taken out of the custody, possession, or dominion
 of Satan; whe. her just or unjust.

not spoiled hell, he had not led captivity captive, he had
 not triumphed in the Fathers sense. Wherefore, being
 the Scriptures teach us not that Christ triumphed in hell;
 being the Triumph which the Fathers mention, was either
 in relation to the damned Soules which Christ took out of
 those tormenting flames, as some imagined, or in reference
 to the spirits of the just, which he took out of those infer-
 nall habitations, as others did conceive; being we have
 already thought fit not to admit either of these two as the
 effect of Christ's Descent, it followeth that we cannot
 acknowledge this as the proper end of the Article. Nor
 can we see how the Prophet David could intend so much,
 as if when he spake those words in the person of our Sa-
 viour, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell*, he should
 have intended this, *Thou shalt not leave my soul separa-*
ted from my body and conveyed into the regions of the
damned spirits, amongst all the principalities and powers
of hell; I say, thou shalt not leave me there, battering

all the infernall strength, redeeming the prisoners; leading captivity captive; and victoriously triumphing over death, and hell, and Satan. In summe, those words of the Prophet cannot admit any interpretation involving a glorious, triumphant and victorious condition, which is not a subject capable of dereliction. For as the hope which he had of his body that it should not see corruption, supposed that it was to be put in the grave, which could not of it self free the body from corruption; so the hope that his soul should not be left in hell, suppoeth it not to be in such a state as was of it self contradictory to dereliction.

* Irenæus so calls his descent, *legem mortuorum servare*, l. 5. c. 16. and S. Hilary expresses that which I intend, *Morte non interceptus est unigenitus Dei filius; ad exemplandam quidem hominis naturam, etiam mori se, id est, discessioni se, tanquam animæ corporis, quæ subiecit, & ad infernas sedes, id quod homini debuit, videtur esse, penetravit*, Enarr. in Psalm. 53. And before him Tertullian,

Christus Deus quia & homo mortuus secundum Scripturas, & sepultus secundum eandem,

And this leads me to that end which I conceive most conformable to the words of the Prophet, and least liable to question or objection. We have already shewn the substance of the Article to consist in this, that the soul of Christ, really separated from his body by death, did truly passe unto the places below where the soules of men departed were. And I conceive the end for which he did so, was, that he might undergöe the condition of a dead man as well as of a living. He appeared here in the similitude of sinfull flesh; and went into the other world in the similitude of a sinner. His body was laid in a grave, as ordinarily the bodies of dead men are; his soul was conveyed into such receptacles as the soules of other persons use to be. All, which was necessary for our redemption by way of satisfaction and merit, was already performed on the Crosse; and all, which was necessary for the actual collation and exhibition of what was merited there, was to be effected upon and after his Resurrection: in the interim therefore there is nothing left, at least known to us, but to satisfie the law of death. This he undertook to doe, and did: and though the Ancient Fathers by the severall additions of other ends have something obscured this, yet it may be sufficiently observed in their writings, and is certainly

hunc quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus, in Anima. ap. 55. Ἡλθεν αὐτὸς ὁ ἰησοῦς πάντων σωτὴρ, καὶ τὰς ἡμῶν ἡρώων μίνας ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν εἰρήνην, ἀνδ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀναμάρτητον αὐτὸν ὑποδέξασθαι. Καταφασμαδιστα ἰδὼν θάνατον εἰς τὸν ἄδω. ἀνιδέξατο καὶ αὐτόν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκένωσιν εἰς αὐτόν, Gelasius Aſſ. Concil. Nicæ. l. 2. c. 32. This S. Austin calls proprietatem carnis, *Contra Felicianum* c. 11. Scio ad inferos Divinitatem Filii Dei descendisse proprietate carnis, scio ad cælum ascendisse carnem meritorie deitatis. And afterwards he calls it injuriam carnis. Erat uno atq; eodem tempore ipse totus etiam in inferno, totus in cælo. illic patiens injuriam carnis, hic non relinquens gloriam deitatis, cap. 14. Impleta est Scriptura quæ dicit. *Et cum iniquis reputatus est.* Quod & alius intelligi potest, dicente de semetipso Domino, *Reputatus sum cum descendens in lacum; factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber.* Vere enim reputatus est inter peccatores & iniquos ut descenderet ad infernum, S. Hieron. in *Isaia* cap. 53. ver. 12. Ruffinus in *his Exposition of the Creed*, descending upon that place of the *Psalms*, factus sum sicut homo sine adjutorio, inter mortuos liber; Non dixit homo, sed sicut homo. Sicut homo enim erat quia etiam descenderat in infernum; sed inter mortuos liber erat, quia à morte teneri non poterat. Et ideo in uno natura humanæ fragilitatis, in alio divinæ potestatis majestatis ostenditur. And yet more pertinently Fulgentius, Restabat ad plenum nostræ redemptionis effectum ut illuc usque homo sine peccato a Deo susceptus descenderet, quousque homo separatus à Deo peccati merito cecidisset, id est, ad infernum, ubi solebat peccatoris anima torqueri, & ad sepulchrum ubi consueverat peccatoris caro corrumpi, *Ad Tractum.* cap. 30. Εἰ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς εἰλθεῖν, καὶ ὡς τὸ πάντες, καὶ ἀποπνεῖσθαι, καὶ ὡς ἰησοῦς ἐν σκότει, καὶ ὡς ἰησοῦς ἀπαύτων, θανάτου καὶ, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἄδω κατάβασιν ἐπαδέξατο, ὡς ἀνὰ πάντα ἡμῶν ὁμοιωθῆναι καὶ ἀμάρτιας, &c. And as Cræ. Sermon. in vitam humanam. I conclude this with that Exposition of S. Hilary upon those words of the *Psalms* 138, If I goe down into hell thou art there also; Humanæ ista lex necessitatis est, ut conspulsis corporibus ad Inferos animæ descendant; Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit, *Psal.* 138.

tainly most conformable to that propheticall expression, upon which we have hitherto grounded our explication, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption.*

Secondly, by the Descent of Christ into hell all those which believe in him are secured from descending thither; he went unto those regions of darknesse that our soules might never come into those torments which are there. By his descent he freed us from our fears, as by his ascension he secured us of our hopes. He passed to those habitations where Satan hath taken up possession, and exerciseth his

Heb. 2. 14

† *Asw r ad*
of the opinion in
Tertullian's

is, though not

of him; S. d in hoc, inquit, Christus inferos adiit ne nos adiremus. Ceterum quod discrimen E. hnicorum & Christianorum, si carcer mortuis idem? De Anima cap. 55. Aut ipsius vox est hic, Et eruiisti animam meam ab inferno infero, aut nostra vox per ipsum Christum Dominum nostrum; quia ideo ille pervenit usque ad infernum, ne nos remaneremus in inferno, S. August. in 1^a sal. 85. Πάσας γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνέλαβε, καὶ πάντων αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἔδεξε, καὶ εἰς τὴν φθῶν κατεβαίνων, ἡμᾶς ἀνέσχετο, S. Athan. in Omnia mihi trad. &c.

H E R O S E A G A I N.

† *For though*
Eusebius Gal-
licanus and
Venantius For-
runatus leave
out the last
word à mortu-
is, and some
Copies in Ruffi-

nus have it not; yet is it generally express'd in all the rest which are more ancient than Eusebius or Fortunatus: and therefore that omission is to be imputed rather to negligence either of the Author or the Scribe, than to the usage of the Church in their age. Quod die tertio resurrexit à mortuis Dominus Christus, nullus ambigit Christu-
nus, S. Aug. Sermon. in Vigiliis Pasche.

dominion; that having no power over him; we might be assured that he should never exercise any over our souls departed, as belonging unto him. *Through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil*, and by his actuall descent into the dominions of him so destroyed, secured all which have an interest in him of the same freedome which he had. Which truth is also still preserved (though among many other strange conceptions) † in the writings of the Fathers. And thus, and for these purposes, may every Christian say, I believe that *Christ Descended into Hell.*

WHatsoever variations have appeared in any of the other Articles, this part of Christ's resurrection hath bin constantly delivered without the least alteration, either by way of addition or † diminution. The whole matter of it is so necessary and essentiall to the Christian faith, that nothing of it could be omitted; and in these few expressions the whole doctrine is so clearly delivered, that nothing needed to be added. At the first view we are

presented with three Particulars: First, the Action it self,

First, or the Resurrection of Christ, *he rose again*. Secondly, the verity, reality, and propriety of that Resurrection, *he rose from the dead*. Thirdly, the Circumstance of Time, or distance of his resurrection from his Death, *he rose from the dead the third day*.

For the illustration of the first Particular, and the justification of our belief in Christs Resurrection, it will be necessary first to shew the promised *Messias* was to rise from the dead; and secondly, that Jesus, whom we believe to be the true and onely *Messias*, did so rise as it was promis'd and foretold. As the *Messias* was to be the son of *David*, so was he particularly typified by him and promised unto him. Great were the oppositions which *David* suffer'd both by his own people and by the nations round about him; which he express'd of himself, and foretold of the *Messias* in those words, *The Kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsell together against the Lord and against his anointed*, that is, his Christ. From whence it came to passe, that *against the holy child Jesus, whom God had anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together to doe whatsoever the hand and the counsell of God determined before to be done*, which was to crucifie and slay the Lord of life. But notwithstanding all this opposition and persecution, it was spoken of *David*, and foretold of the son of *David*, *Yet have I set mine anointed upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son this day have I begotten thee*. As therefore the persecution in respect of *David* amounted onely to a depression of him, and therefore his exaltation was a setting in the kingdome; so being the conspiracy against the *Messias* amounted to a small crucifixion and death, therefore the exaltation must include a resurrection. And being he which riseth from the dead, begins as it were to live another life, & the grave to him is in the manner of a womb to bring him forth, therefore

Psal. 2. 2.

Act. 4. 27, 28.

Psal. 2. 6, 7.

fore when God said of his anointed, *Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee*, he did foretell and promise that he would raise the *Messias* from death to life.

Psal. 16. 10.

Act. 2. 31.

But because this prediction was something obscured in the figurative expression, therefore the Spirit of God hath cleared it further by the same Prophet, speaking by the mouth of *David*, but such words as are agreeable not to the person, but the Son of *David*, *My flesh shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption*. As for the Patriarch *David*, he is both dead and buried, and his flesh consumed in his sepulchre; but being a Prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loynes according to the flesh he would raise up *Christ* to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of *Christ*, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. They were both to be separated by his death, and each to be disposed in that place which was respectively appointed for them: but neither long to continue there, the body not to be detained in the grave, the soul not to be left in hell, but both to meet, and being reunited to rise again.

Isa. 55. 3.

Again, least any might imagine that the *Messias* dying once might rise from death, and living after death yet dye again, there was a further Prophecie to assure us of the excellency of that resurrection and the perpetuity of that life to which the *Messias* was to be rail'd. For God giving this promise to his people, *I will make an everlasting Covenant with you* (of which the *Messias* was to be the Mediator, and to ratifie it by his death) and adding this expression, *even the sure mercies of David*, could signifie no lesse then that the *Christ* who was given first unto us in a frail and mortall condition in which he was to dye, should afterwards be given in an immutable state, and consequently that he being dead should rise unto eternall life. And thus by virtue of these three predictions we

are assured that the *Messias* was to rise again, as also by those types which did represent and presignifie the same. *Joseph*, who was ordained to save his brethren from death who would have slain him, did represent the Son of God, who was slain by us and yet dying saved us; and his being in the dungeon typified Christs death; † his being taken out from thence, represented his resurrection, as his elevation to the power of *Egypt* next to *Pharaoh*, signified the session of Christ at the right hand of his Father. *Isaac* was sacrificed, and yet lived, to shew that Christ should truly dye, and truly live again. And *Abraham* offered him up, accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead, from whence also he received him in a figure. In *Abraham*'s intention *Isaac* dyed, in his expectation he was to rise from the dead, in his acceptance being spared he was received from the dead, and all this acted to presignifie, that the onely son of God was really and truly to be sacrificed and dye; and after death was really and truly to be rais'd to life. What was the intention of our Father *Abraham* not perform'd, that was the resolution of our heavenly Father and fulfill'd. And thus the Resurrection of the *Messias* was represented by types, and foretold by propheties.

† Post duos annos dierum, tertio incipiente, de carcere educitur Joseph. Et noster Joseph Christus Dominus die tertio à mortuis resurrexit. Præsentatur Pharaoni, mundo resurrectio declaratur Data est Joseph à Pharaone in tota Ægypto potestas. Et noster Joseph Christus Dominus post resurrectionem

dic. Data est mihi omnis potestas in celo & in terra, Prosper. de Promis. & Præd. p. 1. c. 29.

a Heb. 11. 19.

Idco Isaac immolatus non quia resurrectio Filio Dei servata est, Prosper. de Prom. & Præd. p. 1. c. 17.

ὅτις ὁ κύριος αἰνῶν πνεύματος ὁ κύριος μυστήτων τῶν κρυπτῶν ἀποκάλυψις ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡγιασμένου ὑπὸ τοῦ συνάγωγας ἁγίων πνεύματος, ὡς διεχθόντων ἐν τῷ μεσσηνίᾳ τὸ πνεῦμα μυστήτων, ἐν ᾧ πνεῦμα μυστήτων τὴν ζωὴν, τὴν μυστήτων πνεύματος τῷ δαδῶν, Greg. Nyss. Orat. 1. in Resur.

That Jesus, whom we believe to be the truly and onely *Messias*, did rise from the dead according to the Scriptures, is a certain and infallible truth, delivered unto us and confirmed by testimonies humane, angelicall, and divine. Those pious women which thought with sweet spices to anoint him dead, found him alive, held him by the feet

Act. 1. 3.

4. 33.

1. 21, 22.

1 Cor. 15. 6.

Joh. 20. 12.

and worship'd him, and as the first preachers of his Resurrection, with fear and great joy ran to bring his disciples word. The blessed Apostles follow them, to whom also he shew'd himself after his passion by many infallible proofs; who with great power gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, the principall part of whose office consisted in this testimony, as appeareth upon the election of *Matthias* into the place of *Judas*, grounded upon this necessity. Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection. The rest of the Disciples testified the same, to whom he also appeared, even to five hundred brethren at once. These were the witnesses of his own family, and such as worship'd him, such as believed in him. And because the Testimony of an adversary is in such cases thought of greatest validity, we have not onely his disciples but even his enemies to confirm it, Those soldiers that watched at the sepulchre, and pretended to keep his body from the hands of his Apostles; they which felt the earth trembling under them, and saw the countenance of an Angel like lightening and his rayment white as snow; they who upon that sight did shake and became as dead men, while he whom they kept became alive: even some of these came into the city and shewed unto the Chief Priests all the things that were done. Thus was the Resurrection of Christ confirmed by the highest humane testimonies, both of his friends and enemies.

But so great, so necessary, so important a mystery had need of a more firm and higher testimony then that of man: and therefore an Angell from heaven who was ministeriall in it, gave a present and infallible witness to it. He descended down, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sate upon it. Nay two Angells in white, sitting the one at the head the other at the foot where the body of Jesus had lain, said unto the women.

Why seek ye the living among the dead? he is not here, but is risen. These were the witnesses sent from heaven, this the Angelicall testimony of the resurrection.

And if we receive the witness of men or Angells, the witness of God is greater, who did sufficiently attest this Resurrection; not onely because there was no other power but that of God which could effect it, but as our Saviour himself said, *the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testifie of me*; adding these words to his Apostles, *and ye shall bear witness, because ye have bin with me from the beginning*. The Spirit of God sent down upon the Apostles did thereby testifie that Christ was risen, because he sent that Spirit from the Father; and the Apostles witnessed together with that Spirit, because they were inlightned, comforted, confirm'd, and strengthened in their testimony by the same Spirit. Thus God raised up Jesus, and shewed him openly, *not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to those who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead*. And thus, as it was foretold of the *Messias*, did our Jesus rise; which was the first part of our enquiry.

For the second, concerning the reality and propriety of Christs Resurrection, expressed in that term *from the dead*, it will be necessary first to consider what are the essentiall characters and proprieties of a true resurrection, and secondly to shew how those proprieties doe belong and are agreeable to the raising of Christ. The proper Notion of the Resurrection consists in this, that it is a substantiall change by which that which was before, and was corrupted, is reproduced the same thing again. It is said to be a change, that it may be distinguished from a second or new creation. For if God should annihilate a man or Angell, and make the same man or Angell out of nothing, though it were a restitution of the same thing, yet were it not properly a resurrection, because it is not a change or proper continuation, but a pure and totall production. This change

is called a substantiall change, to distinguish it from all accidental alterations: he which awaketh from his sleep, riseth from his bed, and there is a greater change from sickness to health, but neither of these is a Resurrection. It is called a change of that which was, and hath bin corrupted, because things immateriall and incorruptible, cannot be said to rise again. resurrection implying a reproduction, and that which after it was never was not cannot be reproduced. Again, of those things which are materiall and corruptible, of some the forms continue and subsist after the corruption of the whole, of others not. The forms of inanimate bodies, and all irrational soules when they are corrupted cease to be, and therefore if they should be reproduced out of the same matter yet were not this a proper resurrection, because thereby they would not be the same individuall which was before, but onely a restitution of the ~~forms~~ by another individuall. But when a rationall soul is separated from it's body, which is the corruption of a man, that soul so separated doth exist, and consequently is capable of conjunction and reunion with the body; and if these two be again united by an essentiall and vitall union, from which life doth necessarily flow, then doth the same man live which liv'd before; and consequently this reunion is a perfect and proper resurrection from death to life, because the same individuall person, consisting of the same soul and body, which was dead, is now alive again.

Having thus delivered the true nature of a proper Resurrection, we shall easily demonstrate that Christ did truly and properly rise from the dead. For first, by a true though miraculons generation he was made flesh; and lived in his humane nature a true and proper life, producing vitall actions as we doe. Secondly, he suffered a true and proper dissolution at his death; his soul being really separated, and his body left without the least vitality, as our dead bodies are. Thirdly, the same soul was reunited to the same body, and so he liv'd again the same

man. For the truth of which, two things were necessary to be shewn, the one concerning the verity, the other concerning the identity of his body. All the Apostles doubted of the first, for when Christ stood in the midst of them *they were affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit*. But he sufficiently assured them of the verity of his corporeity, saying, † *Handle me and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have*. He convinced them all of the identity of his body, saying, *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself*; especially unbelieving Thomas, *Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithlesse but believing*. The body then in which he rose, must be the same in which he liv'd before, because it was the same with which he dyed. And that we might be assured of the soul as well as of the body, first he gave an argument of the vegetative and nutritive faculty, saying unto them, *Have ye here any meat? and they gave him a piece of a broyled fish & of an honey comb, and he took it and did eat before them*: secondly, of the sensitive part, conversing with them, shewing himself, seeing and hearing them: thirdly, he gave evidence of his ratiōall and intellectuall soul, by speaking to them and discoursing out of the Scriptures, concerning those things which he spake *unto them while he was yet with them*.

Thus did he shew, that the body which they saw was truly and vitally informed with an humane soul. And that they might be yet further assured that it was the same soul by which that body liv'd before, he gave a full

testimony of his divinity by the miracle which he wrought in the multitude of fishes caught, by breathing on the Apostles.

Luc. 23. 37.

39.

† Palpandam carnem Dominus præbuit, quam januis clausis introduxit, ut esset post resurrectionem ostenderet corpus suum & ejusdem naturæ & alterius gloriæ.

Greg. Hom. 26.

in Evang. Resurrexit Christus, absoluta res est. Corpus erat, caro erat, pependit in cruce, positus est in sepulchro, exhibuit illam vivam qui vivebat in illa, Serm. 158.

De Tempore.

* Ideo clausis ad discipulos

ostis introibat, & flatu suo dabat Spiritum Sanctum, & dato intelligentiæ luminis sanctarum Scripturarum occulta pandebat; & rursus idem vulnus lateris, fixuræ clavorum, & omnia recentissimæ passionis signa monstrabat, ut agnosceretur in eo proprietates divinitæ humanæque naturæ individua permanere, Leo Serm. 1.

De Resurrectione.

files the Holy Ghost, and by ascending into heaven in the sight of his disciples. For being *no man ascended into heaven but he which came down from heaven the Son of man which was in heaven*, being the divinity was never so united to any humane soul but onely in that person, it appeared to be the same soul with which he liv'd & wrought all the miracles before. To conclude, being Christ appeared after his death with the same body in which he dyed, and with the same soul united to it, it followeth that he rose from the dead by a true and proper Resurrection.

Moreover, that the verity and propriety of Christs Resurrection may further appear, it will be necessary to consider the cause thereof, by what power and by whom it was effected. And if we look upon the meritorious cause we shall find it to be Christ himself. For he by his voluntary sufferings in his life, and exact obedience at his death, did truly † deserve to be raised unto life again. Because he drunk of the brook in the way, because he humbled himself unto death, even to the death of the Crosse, therefore was it necessary that he should be exalted, and the first degree of his exaltation was his resurrection. Now being Christ humbled himself to the sufferings both of soul and body; being whatsoever suffered, the same by the virtue and merit of his passion was to be exalted; being all other degrees of exaltation supposed that of the Resurrection; it followeth from the meritorious cause that Christ did truly rise from the dead with the same soul and the same body with which he liv'd united and dyed separated.

† Ut mediator Dei & hominum homo Christus Iesus resurrectione clarificaretur; prius humilitus est passionis: non enim a mortuis resurrexisset si mortuus non fuisset. Humilitas claritatis est meritum, claritas humilitatis est præmium, S. Aug. Tract. 104. in Joh.

The Efficient cause of the Resurrection of Christ is to be considered either as Principall or Instrumentall. The Principall cause was God himself; for no other power but that which is omnipotent can raise the dead. It is an act beyond the activity of any creature, and unproportionate to the power of any finite Agent. *This Jesus hath*
God

God raised up, saith the Apostle, whereof we all are witnesses. And generally in the Scriptures as our, so Christ's Resurrection is attributed unto God; and as we cannot hope after death to rise to life again without the activity of an infinite and irresistible power, no more did Christ himself, who was no otherwise rais'd then by an eminent act of Gods omnipotency; which is excellently set forth by the Apostle, in so high an exaggeration of expressions as I think is scarce to be parallell'd in any Author, That we may know what is the exceeding greatnesse of his power to our ward who believe, according to the working of the might of his power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him up from the dead. Being then Omnipotency

Eph. i. 19.
κατὰ τὸ ὑ-
περβαλλόν μί-
κρον τῆς δυνά-
μεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ
τῆς ἐνέργειας
τοῦ κράτους τῆς

ἐνέργειας αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐνέργειαν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. Which words our Translation comes fir-
st of, and I doubt our language can scarce reach it. For first, here are δυνάμεις
and ἐνέργειαι, two words to exp. the power of God and the validity and force of it, but
not sufficient; wherefore there is an addition to each of them, μείζων τῆς δυνάμεως,
and κρατος τῆς ἐνέργειας, two words more to expresse the eminent greatnesse of this pow-
er and force, but not sufficient yet; and therefore there is another addition to each ad-
dition, τὸ ὑπερβαλλόν μείζων, and ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ κράτους to set forth the emi-
nence and activity of that greatness; and all yet as it were but flat and dull, till it be
quickned with an active verb ἡ ἐνέργειαν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐργεῖται αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
All which he set on work, all which he actuated in Christ when he raised him from
the dead.

is a divine attribute, and infinite power belongs to God alone; being no lesse power then infinite could raise our Saviour from the dead; it followeth, that whatsoever in-
strumentall action might concur, God must be acknow-
ledged the principall Agent.

And therefore in the Scriptures the Raising of Christ is attributed to God the Father (according to thoe words of the Apostle, Paul an Apostle not of men, neither by Galat. i. 1.
man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead) but is not attributed to the Fa-
ther alone. For to whomsoever that infinite power doth belong, by which Christ was raised, that person must be
acknow-

† Quis nisi solus Filius re-
surrexit, quia
solus mori po-
tuit qui carnē
habuit? & ta-
men ab hoc o-
pere quo solus
Filius resurre-
xit non erat
Pater alienus;
de quo scriptū
est, *Qui susci-
tavit a mortuis
Iesum*. An for-
te se ipse non
suscitavit? Et ubi est quod ait, *Solvite templum hoc, & triduo suscitabo illud;*
& quod potestatem habere se dicit ponendi & iterum sumendi animam suam? Quis
autem ita desipiat, ut Spiritum Sanctum resurrectionem hominis Christi dicat non
cooperatum, cum ipsum hominem Christum fuerit operatus, *S. August.* Contra
Serm. Arria, cap. 15.

acknowledged to have raised him. And because we have
already prov'd that the eternall Son of God is of the same
essence, and consequently of the same power with the Fa-
ther, & shall hereafter shew the same true also of the Holy
Ghost, therefore we must likewise acknowledge that the
† Father, Son, and Holy Ghost raised Christ from the
dead. Nor is this onely true by virtue of this ratiocina-
tion, but it is also delivered expressly of the Son, and that
by himself. It is a weak fallacy used by the *Socinians*,
who maintain that God the Father onely raised Christ, and
then say they teach as much as the Apostles did, who at-
tribute it alwayes either generally unto God, or particula-
ly to the Father. For if the Apostles taught it onely so,
yet if he which taught the Apostles taught us something
more, we must make that also part of our belief. They
believe the Father raised Christ, because *S. Paul* hath
taught them so, and we believe the same; they will not be-

Joh. 2. 19.

21.

Coloss. 2. 9.

lieve that Christ did raise himself, but we must also be-
lieve that, because he hath said so. These were his words
unto the *Jews*, *Destroy this temple and in three dayes I*
will raise it up, and this is the explication of the Apostle,
But he spake of the temple of his body, which he might very
properly call a temple, because *the fulnesse of the Godhead*
dwelt in him bodily. And when he was risen from the dead,
his disciples remembred that he had said this unto them,
and they believed the Scripture and the words that Jesus
had said. Now if upon the Resurrection of Christ the
Apostles believed those words of Christ, *Destroy this*
temple and I will raise it up, then did they believe that
Christ rais'd himself; for in those words there is no person
mentioned but himself. A

A strange opposition they make to the evidence of this Argument, † saying that God the Father raised Christ to life, and Christ being raised to life did lift and raise his body out of the grave, as the man sick of the palsy rais'd himself from the bed, or as we shall raise our selves out of the graves when the trump should sound: and this was all which Christ did or could doe. But if this were true, and nothing else were to be understood in those words of our Saviour, he might as well have said, *Destroy this temple, and in three dayes any one of you may raise it up.* For when life was restored unto it by God, any one of them might have lifted it up, and rais'd it out of the grave, and have shew'n it alive. This answer therefore is a meer shift: for to raise a body which is dead is in the language of the Scriptures to give life unto it, or to quicken a mortall body. b * *For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.* He then which quickeneth the dead bodies of others when he raiseth them, he also quickned his own body when he raised that. The temple is supposed here

† Aliter Deus Christum suscitavit, aliter Christus corpus suum: Deus Christo vitam restituendo, Christus vita recuperata corpus suum levando, & è sepulchro prodeundo, seque post mortem vivum sistendo præbendoque. Sic & Paralyticus ille crexerat corpus suum, accepta à Christo sanitate: sic & omnes mortui surgent,

ex monumentis prodibunt, recepta ab eodem Christo vita, Confessionis Societate vindictes.

a Joh. 2. 19.

b Joh. 5. 21.

† *ἡ ζωὴ καὶ ἡ ζωοποιὸν* is the same thing; and therefore one in the apodosis answereth to both in the prothesis, and sheweth that Christ raiseth and quickeneth whom he will, which demonstrates his infinite and absolute power. Καὶ ἵνα τὸ, ἐδὲν δυνάμει αὐτοῦ πᾶν, τὸ, ὅς ἐστιν, ἀναστῶν ὅτιν. Εἰ γὰρ ὅς ἐστιν, δυνάμει αὐτοῦ πᾶν. τὸ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐξουσίας· εἰ γὰρ ἐδυνάμει αὐτοῦ, ἐκείν ὅς ἐστιν. Τὸ μὲν δυνάμει ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει, τῆς δυνάμεως δὲ κληρονομήσει τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς ἐκείνου· τὸ δὲ, ὅς ἐστιν, τῆς ἐξουσίας τὴν ἐκείνου, S. Chrys. Hom. 38. in Joh.

to be dissolved, and being so to be raised again; therefore the resurrection must answer to the dissolution. But the temple of Christs body was dissolved when his soul was separated, nor was it any other way dissolved then by that separation. God suffered not his holy one to see corruption, and therefore the parts of his body in respect of each other suffered no dissolution. Thus as the Apostle de-

V V V

fired

† Si peccati
confessor revi-
xit à morte,
quis eum sus-
citavit? Nul-
lus mortuus
est sui ipsius
fufcicator. Ille
se potuit susci-
tare qui mor-
tua carne non
mortuus est.
Etenim hoc
fufcitavit quod
mortuum fue-
rat. Ille se
fufcitavit qui
vivebat in fe,
in carne autem
fufcitanda mor-
tuus erat. Non
enim Pater so-
lus Filium sus-
citavit, de quo
dictū est ab A-
postolo, *Pro-
pter quod cum
Deus exaltavit,
sed etiam Do-
minus feipsum,
id est, corpus
suum: unde
dicit, Solvite
templum hoc, &
in triduo susci-
tabo illud.*
S. Aug. *De Ver-
bis Domini*,
Serm. 8.
* Joh. 10.
17, 18.

fired to be dissolved and to be with Christ, so the tem-
ple of Christs body was dissolved here, by the separation
of his soul: for the temple standing was the body living;
and therefore the raising of the dissolved temple was the
quickning of the body. If the body of Christ had bin laid
down in the sepulchre alive, the temple had not bin dis-
solved; therefore to lift it up out of the sepulchre when it
was before quickned was not to raise a dissolved temple,
which our Saviour promised he would doe, and the Apo-
stles believ'd he did.

Again, it is most certainly false that our Saviour had
power onely to lift up his body when it was revived, but
had no power of himself to reunite his soul unto his body,
and thereby to revive it. For Christ speaketh expressly of
himself, *al lay down my life (or soul) that I might take it
again. No man taketh it from me but I lay it down of my
self. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take
it again.* The laying down of Christs life was to dye, and
the taking of it again was to revive: and by this taking of
his life again he shewed himself to be the *Resurrection and
the life*. For he which was *made of the seed of David ac-
cording to the flesh* was declared to be the Son of God with
power, according to the spirit of holinesse, by the resurrec-
tion from the dead. But if Christ had done no more in the
resurrection, then lifted up his body when it was revived,
he had done that which any other person might have done,
and so had not declared himself to be the Son of God in
power. It remaineth therefore, that Christ by that power
which he had within himself did take his life again which
he had laid down, did reunite his soul unto his body from
which he separated it when he gave up the Ghost, and so
did quicken and revive himself: and so it is a certain truth,
† not onely that God the Father rais'd the Son, but also
that God the Son rais'd himself.

From this consideration of the Efficient cause of Christs
Resurrection we are yet further assured, that Christ did
truly

truly and properly rise from the dead in the same soul, and the same body. For if we look upon the Father, it is beyond all controversie that he raised his own Son: and as while he was here alive, God spake from heaven saying, *This is my well beloved Son*; so after his death it was the same person, of whom he spake by the Prophet, *Thou art my son this day have I begotten thee*. If we look upon Christ himself, and consider him with power to raise himself, there can be no greater assurance that he did totally and truly rise in soul and body by that Divinity which was never separated either from the body or from the soul. And thus we have sufficiently prov'd our second Particular, the verity, reality, and propriety of Christs Resurrection, contained in those words, *He rose from the dead*.

The third Particular concerns the time of Christs Resurrection, which is express'd by *the third day*; and those words afford a double consideration: one in respect of the distance of time, as it was after three dayes; the other in respect of the day, which was the third day from his passion, and the precise day upon which he rose. For the first of these, we shall shew that the *Messias* who was foretold both to dye and to rise again, was not to rise before, and was to rise upon the third day after his death, and that, in correspondence to these predictions, our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, did not rise from the dead untill, and did rise from the dead upon the third day.

The typical predictions of this truth were two, answering to our two considerations; one in reference to the distance, the other in respect of the day itself. The first is that of the Prophet *Jonas*, who was in the belly of the great fish three dayes and three nights, and then by the speciall command of God he was rendred safe upon the dry land, and sent a preacher of repentance to the great city of *Ninive*. This was an an expresse type of the *Messias* then to come, who was to preach repentance and remission

Marth. 12. 38.

sion of finnes to all nations ; that as *Jonas* was three dayes and three nights in the whales belly , so should the Son of man be three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth : and as he was restored alive unto the dry land again, so should the *Messias* after three dayes be taken out of the jawes of death and restored unto the land of the living. The type in respect of the day was the waved sheaf in the feast of the first fruits, concerning which this was the

Lev. 23. 10.

law of God by *Moses*. *When ye come into the land which I give unto you , and shall reap the harvest thereof , then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first-fruits of your harvest unto the Priest , and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord to be accepted for you , on the morrow after the sabbath the Priest shall wave it, and ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an hee lamb without blemish of the first yeeve for a burnt offering unto the Lord.* For under the Leviticall law all the fruits of the earth in the land of *Canaan* were profane ; none might eat of them till they were consecrated, and that they were in the feast of the first-fruits. One sheaf was taken out of the field and brought to the Priest, who lifted it up as 'twere in the name of all the rest, waving it before the Lord, and it was accepted for them, so that all the sheaves in the field were holy by the acceptance of that. *For if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy.* And this was alwayes done the day after the sabbath, that is, the Paschal solemnity, after which the fulness of the harvest followed : by which thus much was foretold and represented, that as the sheaf was lifted up and waved, and the lamb was offered on that day by the Priest to God, so the promised *Messias*, that immaculate lamb which was to dye, that Priest which dying was to offer up himself to God, was upon this day to be lifted up and raised from the dead, or rather to shake and lift up and present himself to God, and so to be accepted for us all, that so our dust might be sanctified, our corruption hallowed, our mortality consecrated to eternity. Thus was the

Rom. 11. 16.

Lev. 23. 10.

101

the Resurrection of the *Messias* after death typically represented both in the distance and the day.

And now in reference to both resemblances, we shall clearly shew that our Jesus, whom we believe, and have already prov'd to be the true *Messias*, was so long and no longer dead, as to rise the third day; and did so order the time of his death, that the third day on which he rose might be that very day on which the sheaf was waved, the day after that Sabbath mentioned in the law.

As for the distance between the Resurrection and the death of Christ, it is to be considered first generally in itself, as it is some space of time; secondly, as it is that certain and determinate space of three days. Christ did not, would not, suddenly rise, lest any should doubt that he ever dyed. It was as necessary for us that he should dye, as that he should live, and we, which are to believe them both, were to be assured as well of the one as of the other. That therefore we may be ascertained of his death, he did some time continue it. † He might have descended from the Cross before he dyed, but he would not, because he had undertaken to dye for us. * He might have reviv'd himself upon the Cross, after he had given up the ghost, and before *Joseph* came to take him down, but he would not, lest as *Pilate* questioned whether he were already dead, so we might doubt whether he ever dyed. The reward of his Resurrection was immediately due upon his Passion, but he deferred the receiving of it, lest either of them being question'd, they both might loose their efficacy and intended operation. It was therefore necessary that some space should intercede between them. Again, because Christs exaltation was due unto his humiliation, and the first step of that was his Resurrection; because the Apostles after his death were to preach repentance and remis-

† De cruce descendere poterat, sed differrebat ut de sepulchro resurgeret, S. Aug. in Job. Tract. 12.
* Ἡδυνάτω μὲν καὶ παρ' αὐτὰ τὴ θανάτου τὸ σῶμα διεγείρειν καὶ πάλιν δώσει ζῶν. ἡμὰ καὶ τὸ τοῦ κελῶς περιδύν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν πεποίηκε. Εἶπε γὰρ αὐτὸς μὲν ὅπως αὐτὸ τεθυνηκάναι, ἢ μὴ δὲ τέλειον αὐτὸ τὸ θάνατον ἐξαικέναι, οἱ παρ' αὐτὰ ἴδοντες αἰδύσαντες ἦν ἐπιδοκίμαζαν. Τὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐν ἰσχύϊ τοῦ διαστήματος οὐκ ἔστι τὸ τε θάνατον καὶ τὸ ἀναστάσεως ἀδύνατον ἐγένετο τὸ πρὶ τ' ἀφθαρσίαι κλέος. Ὅθεν ἵνα διεγερθεὶς καρδὴν ἰδὼν σῶμα, καὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ μέσῃ ὁ λόγος, καὶ τελευτῶν τὸ τοῦ πᾶσιν ἐδει-

ξω ἀφάρτων, S. Athan. de Incarnat. Verbi. Καὶ ᾤεις ὅτι ἡμῶν διὰ τὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος, ἵνα περὶ ὃν ἀπέθανεν, ὃ γὰρ τὸ σώμα αὐτοῦ μόνον βεβαίωται, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅψι, ἡμὰ καὶ τὸ γένος ἡμῶν, S. Chryl. Hom. 43. in Matth.

tion of finnes through his blood, who were no way qualified to preach any such doctrine till he rose again, because the Spirit could not be sent till he ascended, and he could not ascend into heaven till he rose from the grave; therefore the space between his Resurrection and Passion could not be long, nor can there be any reason assigned why it should any longer be deferr'd, when the verity of his death was once sufficiently prov'd. Least therefore his Disciples should be long held in suspense, or any person after many dayes should doubt whether he rose with the same body with which he dyed, or no; that he might shew himself alive while the souldiers were watching at his grave, and while his crucifixion was yet in the mouthes of the people, he would not stay † many dayes before he rose. Some distance then of time there was, but not great, between his crucifixion and his resurrection.

† Ενεκεν ᾧ οὐκ
ἔτι δειχθῆναι
τὸν θάνατον ἐν
τῷ σώματι τῷ
ταύτον ἀνέστη

τὸτο· ἵνα ᾧ μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ διαμῶναι καὶ φθαρὲν τίλειον ὕστερον ἀναστήσει ἀπὸ τῆς
ὡς ἐκ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐπεὶ ἐπὶ σῶμα φέρον (ἐμελλε γὰρ αὐτὸς καὶ δι' αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀπεῖναι
τῷ φαινομένῳ καὶ ὁππότε ἀνέστη καὶ ἡμετέροις) διὰ τὸτο ἐπὶ πλείω καὶ προῖον ἡ-
γετο ὅτι ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ ἀκέραια αὐτὸς καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως παρόλκυσεν· ὅτι
ἔτι καὶ ἀκοῶν αὐτοῦ ἐναυλον ἐχόντων τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἔτι καὶ ὁρῶντων αὐτοῦ ἐν
διχομένῳ, καὶ τῆς διανοίας αὐτοῦ ἡρπήμενης, καὶ ζώντων ἐπὶ γῆς ἔτι καὶ ἐν
τόποις ὄντων καὶ θανάτουσάντων καὶ μὴ τυρέντων καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ τῷ Κυριακῷ σώ-
ματι, αὐτὸς ὁ τῷ Θεῷ ὅδε ἐν τριταίῳ διαστήματι τὸ ἡμετέριον νεκρὸν σῶμα
ἐδείξεν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀφθαρτον, Ibid.

Mar. 12. 40.

The particular length of this space is determined in the third day: but that expression being capable of some diversity of interpretation, it is not so easily concluded how long our Saviour was dead or buried before he revived or rose again. It is written expressly in *S. Matthew*, that *Jonas was three dayes and three nights in the whales belly, so should the Son of man be three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth*. From whence it seemeth to follow, that Christs body was for the space of three whole dayes and three whole nights in the grave, and after that space of time rose from thence. And hence some have con-
ceived,

sidered, that being our Saviour rose on the morning of the
 first day of the week, therefore it must necessarily follow
 that he dyed and was buried on the fifth day of the week
 before, that is on Thursday; otherwise it cannot be true that
 he was in the grave three nights. But this place, as express
 as it seems to be, must be considered with the rest in
 which the same truth is delivered; as when our Saviour
 said, *After three dayes I will rise again:* and again, *De-* Mar. 27. 63.
stroy his temple and in three dayes I will build it up, or, Mar. 8. 32.
within three dayes I will build another made without Joh. 2. 19.
hands. But that which is most used, both in our Saviours Mar. 14. 58.
 prediction before his death; and in the Apostles language
 after the resurrection, is, that *† he rose from the dead the*
third day. Now according to the language of the Scri- Mar. 16. 21.
 ptures; if Christ were slain and rose the third day, the day 17. 23.
 in which he dyed is one, and the day on which he rose is 20. 19.
 another, and consequently there could be but one day and Mar. 9. 31.
 two nights between the day of his death and of his resur- 10. 34.
 rection. As in the case of circumcision, the male child Luc. 9. 22.
 eight dayes-old was to be circumcised, in which the day on 18. 33.
 which the child was born was one, and the day on which 24. 7. 46.
 he was circumcised was another, and so there were but six Aēt. 10. 40.
 complete dayes, between the day of his birth and the day 1 Cor. 15. 4.
 of his circumcision. The day of Pentecost was the fiftieth *† These severall*
 day from the day of the wave-offering; but in the number *phrases are u-*
 of the fifty dayes was both the day of the wave-offering *sed; first, that*
 and of Pentecost included; as now among the Christians *Christ was in*
 still it is. Whit Sunday is now the day of Pentecost, and *the heart of the*
 Easter day, the day of the resurrection, answering to that of *earth* *τῆς ἡμῶ-*
 the wave-offering; but both these must be reckoned to *εας, ἡ τρεῖς*
 make the number of fifty dayes. Christ then who rose *νύκτας* *se-*
 upon the first day of the week (as is confessed by all) *condly, that he*
 dyed upon the sixth day of the week before: or if he had *was to rise* *τὰ τρεῖς ἡμέ-*
 dyed upon the fifth he had risen not upon the third but the *εας* *thirdly,*
that he would
rebuild this
temple ἐν τρε-
σὶν ἡμέραις,
and lastly that he rose *τῇ τρετῇ ἡμέρᾳ,* which is the most
 usual and constant form of speech.

fourth.

† Lazarus is said to be τεταρτῆς, four days dead, that is, computing the day on which he dyed, and the day on which his sister spake so to our

Saviour at his sepulchre. And being he was raised then, he rose τῇ τεταρτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, the fourth day. Our Saviour rose τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, and therefore he was τεταρτῆς when he rose; and so the Fathers call him, as you may observe in the words last cited out of Athanasius. As we read in Plutarch, Σολῶς ὁ Θεωρετικὸς . . . ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τεταρτῆς ἡμέρᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνέστηκα, De his qui sero pun. And of that Spirit in a Boy possessed, who hated all women ἐπεὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τὴν ἐνὶ τῷ βρεστὶ, τριταῖα καὶ ὡς γαμνηθεῖσα ἐτέρῳ, Philostratus l. 3. c. 12. What this τεταρτῆς is, the Greek Grammarians will teach us. Περεὶ τοῦ πόσον ἀπαυτῶ τὸ τεταρτῆς ἢ πέντατος, περὶ τὸ πόσον τὸ τρίτον ἢ τέταρτον ἐπὶ τάξεως, περὶ τὸ πόσον τὸ τεταρτῆς ἢ τεταρτῆς. ὅς περὶ τὸ, ποσῶν ἀπ' ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ πάρεστι, αὐτῆς τὸ, τεταρτῆς ἢ τεταρτῆς, ἢ ὡς τετὴν ἡμέραν ἔχω ἀπ' ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἢ τεταρτῆς, Schol. Eurip. Hecuba. Τεταρτῆς then, in respect of his coming to or from any place, is that person which is now the third day in or from that place; which cannot be better interpreted, as to the Greek language, then in the expression of a tertian Fever, called so, because the second accession is upon the third day from the first, and the third from the second, &c. in which case there is but one day between, in which the patient is wholly free from his disease: from when ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, and τριταῖος is the same in the language of the Physicians. This is excellently expressed by Alexander Aphrodisius in that problematick all Question, Διὰ τί ὁ μὲν τριταῖος ἐν διαμυῖ χυμῷ γιγνόμενος, καὶ ἔχων μασιζὺς καὶ καταλύνας χολὴν, ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ κινεῖται. ὁ δὲ ἀμφημερινός, ἔχων πιδνὴ τὸ φλέγμα τῇ βαρύτητι καὶ ψυχρότητι καὶ δὲ ἡμέραν. ὁ δὲ τεταρτῆς διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων, Problem. 10. l. 2. The Quotidian ague hath its accessions καὶ δὲ ἡμέραν. The Tertian ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ (sub ἡμέραν) after one day of perfect intermission; the Quartan διὰ δύο ἡμερῶν μέσων. In the same manner he mentions the πεμνηταῖος, the ἑβδομηταῖος, and ὀνναταῖος: in all which this is constantly observable, that the days of perfect intermission are fewer by two, then the number in the name of the fever: for if the Fever be a τριταῖος the day of intermission is but one, if τεταρταῖος two, if πεμνηταῖος three, if ἑβδομηταῖος five, if ὀνναταῖος seven. Thus if our Saviour were one whole day in the grave, and dyed the day before, and rose the day after, he did rise τεταρταῖος; if he were two whole days in the grave, he rose τεταρταῖος. So Aristotle, Διὰ τί ὁ νεκταίνων βαρύνει τεταρταῖος ἀνέγει; πότερον ὅτι ἀπὸ μικρῶς καὶ ἀδενὸς ἀρχῆς; ἢ τετὴν ὅτι κρίσιμος, Probl. 14. S. 8. 26. Τῇ τετῇ therefore and τριταῖος is the same. For from τετὴν comes τριταῖος, and from τεταρτῆς, τεταρταῖος, &c. in which ἡμέρα is always under-

μενοις ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας αὐτῆς μένης σωματικῶς; ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ νυκτὸς χρόνον καὶ τὸ
 οὐδὲ καὶ μὴ πρὶς αὐτῶν ἡμερῶν ἢ ἀπομνημονεύοντες τὸν χρόνον ἐν ᾧ ὁ
 γῆς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνεται περισσώδεις ἡμέρας; ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν νυκτὸς αὐτῶν περι-
 δύντες, ὥπως δὲ πῶς καὶ τὸν ὁριστὸν πύτη καὶ ἐξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἡμερῶν ἢ
 φασμέν, De Crisibual. 2. This is observed by S. Basil to be also the custome of the
 Scriptures, upon those words in Genesis, Ἐγένετο οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ, ἔγένετο πρῶτος ἡ
 ἡμερονύκτιον λέγει: καὶ ἔτι περιηρόμενοι, ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀπομνημονεύον
 τὴν πᾶσαν περιηρόμεν ἀπὸ τῆς. Ταύτην αὖ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ γράφῃ τὴν σωματικῶν ὁ-
 ρισ ἐν τῇ τῷ χρόνῳ μετρήσει, ἡμέρας ἡριθμημένας, καὶ ὁ νύκτας μὴ τῆς ἡμε-
 ρῶν, In Hexam. Hom. 2. Now being generally in all computations of time, as S.
 Basil observeth, ἐν τῇ τῷ χρόνῳ μετρήσει, a day was taken for the whole space of day
 and night; and as the evening and the morning signifieth the same, that is, a day; and
 2300. evenings and mornings no more then so many days; and so three days and three
 nights in the computation of time signifie no more then three days. (For God called the
 light Day, and the darknesse he called Night, and the evening and the morning
 were the first day, and the evening and the morning were the second day, &c.) Be-
 ing three dayes in the language of the Scripture are said to be fulfilled when the third
 day is come, though it be not wholly passed over; it followeth, that to be three dayes
 dead, or to be three dayes and three nights dead, in the Hebrew language, came
 necessarily inferre any more, then that the person spoken of did continue dead till the
 third day. a Dan. 8. 14.

LUC. 2. 21.

upon the last of those three dayes he rose. As we find that
 eight dayes were accomplished for the circumcision of the
 child; and yet Christ was born upon the first and circum-
 cised upon the last of those eight dayes: now were there a-
 ny more then six whole dayes between the day of his birth
 and the day of his circumcision; the one upon the five and
 twentieth of December, the other upon the first of Janu-

† As we read of
 the circumci-
 sion of our Sa-
 viour, ἐπὶ τῇ
 ὀκτῷ ἡμέραις
 ὀκτῷ ὡς Ζα-
 χαριῶν, ὡς ὡς ἡμέ-
 ραι τῆς ἀορίστου
 γῆρας αὐτοῦ.

and though the number ὀκτῷ were not express'd yet it is to be understood,
 according to the language of the Scripture in other cases, and of Josephus particularly
 in this, Διήλασε ὁ μὲν πατριὸν διακοσίων τῶν ὅσων ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ὀκτῷ, καὶ
 Καθάρτη ἐπὶ ἑβδωμύτῃ.

the Son of God was crucified, dead, and buried, and the day on which he revived and rose again, were included in the number of three dayes. And thus did our Saviour rise from the dead upon the third day properly, and was three dayes and three nights in the heart of the earth * *syn-* *So S. Hierome on Jonas 2. 1.*
Ecdochically. *Et erat Jonas in ventre pis-*

is tribus diebus & tribus noctibus. Hujus loci mysterium in Evangelio Dominus exponit, & superfluum est vel idipsum vel aliud dicere. Hoc solum quarimus, quomodo tres dies & tres noctes fuerit in corde terræ. vidam *magaxdny*, quando Sole fugiente, ab hora sexta usque ad horam nonam nox successit diei, in duobus dies & noctes dividunt, & apponentes Sabbatum, tres dies & tres noctes æstiment supputandas: nos vero *Cyranobxkxw*; totum intelligamus à parte; ut ex eo quod dicit *magaxdny* mortuus est, unam diem supputemus & noctem, & sabbati alteram; tertiam vero noctem, quæ diei & Dominicæ nuncupatur, referamus ad exordium diei alterius: nam & in Genesi nox præcedentis diei (*adde non*) est sed sequentis, id est, principium futuri non finis præteriti. *To the same purpose S. Austin;* Ipsum autem triduum non totum & plenum fuisse Scriptura testis est; sed primus dies à parte extrema totus annumeratus est; dies vero tertius à parte prima & ipse totus; medius autem inter eos, id est, secundus dies absolute totus viginti quatuor horis suis, duodecim nocturnis & duodecim diurnis. Crucifixus est enim primo Judæorum vocibus hora tertia, cum esset dies sexta sabbati. Deinde, in ipsa cruce suspensus est hora sexta, & spiritum redidit hora nona. Sepultus est autem cum jam sero factum esset: sic sese habent verba Evangelii quod intelligitur in fine diei. Unde libet ergo incipias, etiamsi alia ratio reddi potest, quomodo non sit contra Evangelium Johannis, ut hora tertia ligno suspensus intelligatur, totum diem primum non comprehendis. Ergo à parte extrema totus computabitur, sicut tertius à parte prima. Nox enim usque ad diluculum quo Domini resurrectio declarata est, ad tertium diem pertinet, *De Trinit. l. 4. c. 6.*

This is sufficient for the clearing the precise distance of Christs Resurrection from his Crucifixion, expressed in the determinate number of three dayes: the next consideration is, what day of the week that *third day* was, on which Christ did actually rise, and what belongeth to that day in relation to his Resurrection. Two characters there are which will evidently prove the particularity of this third day: the first is the description of that day in respect of which this is called the *third*, after the manner already delivered & confirmed; the second is the Evangelists expression of the time on which Christ rose. *X x x 2* The

† Παρεσκευή,
Parasceue inter-
pretatur præ-
paratio, scilicet
S. Augustine,
and in the Greek
language it sig-

nifies generally any preparation of what nature soever: but in this case it signifies rather the time in which preparation was made; as Luc. 23. 54. Καὶ ἡμερὰν παρεσκευήθησαν αὐτοὶ τὸ σάββατον and that preparation among the Jews for the Sabbath; as S. Mark 15. 42. Ἐπειδὴ παρεσκευήθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸ σάββατον, ἡ τῇ μετὰ ταῦτα παρεσκευήθησαν ὑπὸ ὧρας ἑβδόμης, Jud. Ant. l. 6. c. 10. This παρεσκευήθη of the Hebrews was answerable to the cœna pura of the Gentiles, as the Old Glossary, Cœna pura, παρεσκευήθη. & in Gloss. Latina-Arabica, Parasceue cœna pura, id est, preparatio quæ fit pro sabbato. From whence some of the Fathers did so interpret the Eves of the Jewish Sabbaths, as Tertullian, Dies observatis & menses & tempora & annos & sabbata, ut opinor, & cœnam puras, & jejunia & dies magnos, Adv. M. rcism. l. 5. c. 4. Acce eratam vult intelligi sepulturam ne ad vesperasceret, quando jam propter parasceuen, quam cœnam puram Judæi Latine usitatus apud nos vocant, facere tale quid non licebat, S. Aug. Tract. 76. in Joh. And the Ancient Translators of the Greek Fathers did use the Latine cœna pura for the Greek παρεσκευήθη. As the Interpreter of S. Chrysostome, Serm. in Natalem. Joh. Bapt. Qua enim die conceptus est Dominus eadem die & passus est; eadem ipsa dies cœna pura fuit, in qua & luna quatuordecima occurrit. Solikewise the Old Interpreter of Irenæus, Parasceue quæ dicitur cœna pura, id est, sexta feria, quam & Dominus ostendit passus. in ea, Iren. l. 5. c. 23. & lib. 1. Moheni sexta die dixisse, quæ est in cœna pura. As therefore the Cœna pura among the Gentiles was that time in which they prepared and sanctified themselves for their sacred solemnities, so the Jews did make use of that word to signify their sanctification, and of the Greek παρεσκευήθη to testify the preparation of all things used on their holy dayes, upon the Eve thereof, or day before. Parasceue Latine preparatio est, sed isto verbo Græco libentius utuntur Judæi in hujusmodi observationibus, etiam qui magis Latine quam Græce loquuntur, scilicet S. Austin Tract. 117. in Joh. So that the same Father testified that the Jews speaking Latine in his time did sometime use parasceue, sometime cœna pura for their Eve of preparation. Other wise in their own language they called it כוון, or כוון; by which generally they understood the sixth day of the week, the day before the Sabbath. For they reckoned the dayes of the week in Bereshit Rabba, כוון the first of the week, כוון the second, כוון the third, כוון the fourth, כוון the fifth, כוון the Eve, כוון the Sabbath. Thus in Hebrew כוון, in Greek παρεσκευήθη, in Latine Cœna pura, were used by the Jews for the same day, the Friday or sixth of the week; but not for that alone, but for the Eve of any great Festival, which at

joined to a Sabbath, so that they had their *שבת* *שבת* and *יום טוב* as *μεγάλη*
εὐχὴ τῇ σάββατῃ, and *μεγαλοῦν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*. And when a great Festivall fell upon
the Sabbath, then as the Festivities were both one day, so the Eeve to both was
the same Friday: And such was the day of preparation on which our Saviour
was crucified: a Joh. 19. 42. b Mar. 27. 62.

Now this day of preparation was the day immediately
before the Sabbath or some other great feast of the Jews, cal-
led by them the Eeve of the Sabbath or the feast; and
therefore called the preparation, because on that day they
did prepare whatsoever was necessary for the celebration
of the following festivall; according to that command in
the case of *Manna*, *It shall come to passe that on the*
sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and Exod. 16. 5.
it shall be twice as much as they gather dayly. This pre-
paration being used both before the Sabbath and other Fe-
stivalls, at this time it had both relations: for first, it was
the preparation to a Sabbath; as appeareth by those words
of S. Mark, *Now when the Eeve was come, because it* Mar. 15. 42.
was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath;
and thole of S. Luke, *That day was the preparation, and* Luc. 23. 54.
the Sabbath drew on. Secondly, it was also the Eeve of
a Festivall, even of the great day of the Paschall so-
lemnity, as appeareth by S. John, who saith, when Pilate
set down in the judgement seat, *it was the Preparation of* Joh. 19. 32.
the Passeover. And that the great Paschall festivity did
then fall upon the Sabbath, so that the same day was then
the preparation or Eeve of both, appeareth yet further by
the same Evangelist, saying, *The Jews therefore, be-*
cause it was the preparation, that the bodies should not
remain upon the Crosse on the Sabbath day, for that Sab-
bath day was an high day; that is, not onely an ordinary
or weekly Sabbath, but also a great festivall even a Pas-
chall Sabbath. Now being the Sabbath of the Jews was
constant and fixed to the seventh day of the week, it fol-
loweth that the Preparation or Eeve thereof must necessa-
rily be the sixth day of the week, which from the day, and

the infinite benefit accruing to us by the Passion upon that day, we call *Good Friday*. And from that day being the sixth of one, the third must consequently be the first of the next week.

Mar. 16. 1. 2.

Mat. 28. 1.

Luc. 24. 1.

Joh. 20. 1.

The next Character of this third day is the expression of the time of the Resurrection in the Evangelists. *When the Sabbath was past*, saith S. Mark, which was the day after the preparation on which he was buried, *very early in the morning the first day of the week*. In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, saith S. Matthew. *Upon the first day of the week early in the morning*, saith S. Luke. *The first day of the week early when it was yet dark*, saith S. John. By all which indications it appeareth that the body of Christ being laid in the sepulchre on the day of the preparation, which was the Eve of the Sabbath, and continuing there the whole Sabbath following, which was the conclusion of that week, and further resting there still and remaining dead the night which followed that Sabbath, but belonged to the first day of the next week, about the end of that night early in the morning was revived by the accession and union of his soul, and rose again out of the sepulchre. Whereby it came to passe, that the obligation of the day, which was then the Sabbath, dyed and was buried with him, but in a manner by a diurnall transmutation reviv'd again at his Resurrection. Well might that day which carried with it a remembrance of that great deliverance from the *Egyptian* servitude resign all the sanctity or solemnity due unto it, when that morning once appear'd upon which a far greater Redemption was confirm'd. One day of seven was set apart by God in imitation of his rest upon the creation of the world, and that seventh day which was sanctified to the *Jews* was reckoned in relation to their deliverance from *Egypt*. At the second delivery of the law we find this particular cause assigned, *Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the*

Deut. 5. 15.

the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arme, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day. Now this could not be any speciall reason why the Jews should observe a seventh day; first, because in reference to their redemption, the number of seven had no more relation then any other number; secondly, because the reason of a seventh day was before rendred in the body of the commandment it self. There was therefore a double reason rendred by God why the Jews should keep that Sabbath which they did; one Specificall, as to a seventh day, to shew they worshipped that God who was the Creator of the world; the other Individuall, as to that seventh day, to signifie their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage, from which that seventh day was dated. Being then upon the Resurrection of our Saviour a greater deliverance and far more plenteous redemption was wrought then that of Egypt, and therefore a greater observance was due unto it then to that, the individuall determination of the day did passe upon a stronger reason to another day, alwayes to be repeated by a seventhly return upon the reference to the Creation. As there was a change in the year at the coming out of Egypt, by the command of God; *This month, the month of Abib, shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you:* so at this time of a more eminent deliverance a change was wrought in the Hebdomadall or weekly account, and the first day is made the seventh, or the seventh after that first is sanctified. The first day, because on that Christ rose from the dead, and the seventh day from that first for ever, because he who rose upon that day was the same God who created the world, and rested on the seventh day; *For by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, all things were created by him and for him.* This day did the Apostles from the beginning most religiously observe, by their meeting together for holy purposes and

Exod. 12. 2.

Coloss. 1. 16.

a Joh. 20. 19.

b Joh. 20. 26.

c Act. 2. 1.

d 41.

e Act. 20. 7.

f Rev. 1. 10.

† Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ

ἀπερμήνη ἡμέρᾳ

παύτων καὶ

πρόλας ἢ ἀρχῆς

μαρόντων ἐπὶ

τὸ αὐτὸ Σωτή-

λεως γίνεται,

Just. Martyr

Apol. 2. & pau-

lo post, Τὴν δὲ

αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡμέ-

ραν κοινῇ παύ-

τες πῶς Σωτή-

λεως ποιεῖ-

μεθα, ἐπι-

δαὶ πρῶτη ἐστὶν

ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ ὁ

Θεὸς τὸ σκό-

τῳ καὶ τὴν ὕ-

λιν τρέφας,

κόσμον ἐποίη-

σε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς

Χεῖρος ὁ ἡμέ-

περος Σωτῆς τῇ

αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ

νεκρῶν ἀνέστη.

Τῇ δὲ πρῶτῇ

Κερνικῇ ἐς αὐ-

ρωτῇ αὐτὸν, καὶ

τῇ μετὰ τὴν

Κερνικὴν, ἥ τις

ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, πα-

νοῖς τοῖς Ἀπο-

στόλοις αὐτῷ καὶ

μαρτυροῖς, ἐ-

κδομένη πᾶσι

ἀπὸ οὗ ἐπι-

σκαψεν καὶ οὐκ

ἀνεδύναται.

Nobis quibus Sabbata extranea sunt & neomenia & feriae à Deo aliquan-

to perform religious duties. The first observation was performed providentially, rather by the design of God than any such inclination or intention of their own: For *a the same day*, saith the Evangelist, that is the day on which Christ rose from the dead, *at evening, being the first day of the week, the Disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews.* The second observation was performed voluntarily, *b for after eight dayes again his Disciples were within, and Thomas with them:* the first day of the week, when Christ rose by the providence of God the Disciples were together, but Thomas was absent; upon the first day of the next week, they are all met together again in expectation of our Saviour, and Thomas with them. Again, *c when the day of Pentecost was fully come*, which was also the first day of the week, *they were all with one accord in one place;* and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues, preached the Gospell, and the *d same day were added unto them about three thousand soules.* The same practice of convening we find continued in the following yeares. For *e upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them:* and the same Apostle gave expresse command concerning the collection for the Saints both to the Churches of Galatia and of Corinth. *Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prosper'd him.* From this Resurrection of our Saviour, & the constant practice of the Apostles, this first day of the week came to have the name of the *Lords day*, and is so called by S. John, who sayes of himself in the *Revelation*, *f I was in the Spirit on the Lords day.* And thus the observation of that day, which the Jews did sanctifie, ceased, and was buried with our Saviour, & in the stead of it, the religious observation of † that day on which the Son of God rose from the dead, by the constant practice of the blessed Apostles was transmitted to the Church of God & so continued in all ages.

This

do

consonant, strenz consonant, lusus, convivia constrepunt. O melior fides nationum in suam sectam, quæ nullam solennitatem Christianorum sibi vindicat, non Dominicum Diem, non Pentecosten, *Tertul. de Idol. c. 14.* Cum in septimo die Sabbati sit & nomen & observantia constituta, tamen nos in octava die, quæ ipsa prima est, perfecti sabbati festivitate lætamur, *S. Hi'ar. Prolog. in P'al.* Quid est secunda sabbati nisi Dominica dies quæ Sabbatum sequebatur? Dies autem abbari erat dierum ordine posterior, sanctificatione legis anterior: Sed ubi finis legis advenit, & resurrectione sua octavam sanctificavit, cœpit eadem prima esse quæ octava est, & octava quæ prima, habens ex numeri ordine prærogativam, & ex resurrectione Domini sanctitatem, *S. Ambros. Enr. in P'salm. 47.* Dicat aliquis, Si dies observari non licet, & menses & tempora & annos, nos quoque simile crimen incurrimus, quartam Sabbati observantes, & parasceven, & diem Dominicam, *S. Hieron. in Epist ad Gal. cap. 4. vers. 10. And S. Augustine in answer to the same objection,* Nam nos quoque & Dominicum diem & Pascha solenniter celebramus & quaslibet alias Christianas dierum festivitates, *Contra Adimantum cap. 16.* Dies Dominicus non Judæis sed Christianis resurrectione Domini declaratus est, & ex illo habere cœpit festivitatem suam, *S. Aug. Epist. 119.* Hæc tamen septima erit Sabbatum nostrum, cujus finis non erit vespera sed Dominicus dies velut octavus æternus, qui Christi resurrectione sacraus est, æternam non solum spiritus verum etiam corporis requiem præfigurans, *Idem de Civitate Dei l. 22. c. 30.* Dominicum diem Apostoli & Apostolici viri ideo religiosa solennitate habendum sanxerunt, quia in eodem Redemptor noster à mortuis resurrexit. Quicquid ideo Dominicus appellatur ut in eo à terrenis operibus vel mundi illecebris abstinentes tantum divinis cultibus serviamus, dantes scilicet dici huic honorem & reverentiam præpter spem resurrectionis nostræ quam habemus in illa. Nam sicut ipse Dominus Iesus Christus & Salvator resurrexit à mortuis, ita & nos resurrekturos in novissimo die speramus, *Autor. Serm. de Tempore, Serm. 251. & paulo post,* Sancti Doctores Ecclesiæ decreverunt omnem gloriam Judaici Sabbati in illam transferre, ut quod ipsi in figura, nos celebraremus in veritate. *Περὶ τῆς οὐκ ἢ πνευματικῆς τοῦ πάθους, ἡ δὲ σάββατον τὴν ταφὴν, ἡ Κυριακὴ τὴν ἀνάστασιν,* *Author Clem. Constitut. lib. 3. cap. 13.*

This day thus consecrated by the Resurrection of Christ was left as the perpetuall badge and cognizance of his Church. As God spake by *Moses* to the *Israelites*, *Verily my Sabbath ye shall keep, for it is a signe between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctifie you;* therby leaving a mark of distinction upon the *Jews*, who were by this means known to worship that God whose name was *Jehovah*, who made the world, and delivered them from the hands of *Pharaoh*: So we must conceive that he hath given us

EX. 31. 13.

Y y y this

this day as a signe between him and us for ever, whereby we may be known to worship the same God *Jehovah*, who did not onely create heaven and earth in the beginning, but also raised his eternall Son from the dead for our redemption. As therefore the *Jews* doe still retain the celebration of the seventh day of the week, because they will not believe any greater deliverance wrought then that of *Egypt*: as the *Mahometans* religiously observe the six day of the week in memory of *Mahomet's* flight from *Mecca*, whom they esteem a greater Prophet then our Saviour: as these are known and distinguished in the world by these severall celebrations of distinct dayes in the worship of God; so all which professe the Christian Religion are known publickly to belong unto the Church of Christ by observing the first day of the week, upon which Christ did rise from the dead, and by this mark of distinction are openly † separated from all other professions.

† Quid hac die felicius, in qua Dominus Judæis mortuus est, nobis resur-

rexit? in qua Synagogæ cultus occubuit, & est ortus Ecclesiæ; in qua nos homines fecit secum surgere & vivere & sedere in cœlestibus, & impletum est illud quod ipse dixit in Evangelio, Cum autem exaltatus fuero à terra omnia traham ad me. Hæc est dies quam fecit Dominus, exulemus & lætemur in ea. Omnes dies quidem fecit Dominus, sed cæteri dies possunt esse Judæorum, possunt esse hereticorum, possunt esse Gentilium; Dies Dominica, dies resurrectionis, dies Christianorum, dies nostra est; *Explan. in Psalm. 117. sub nomine Hieron.*

That Christ did thus rise from the dead, is a most necessary Article of the Christian faith, which all are obliged to believe and professe, to the meditation whereof the Apostle hath given a particular injunction, *Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead.* First, because without it our faith is vain, and by virtue of it, strong. By this we are assured that he which dyed was the Lord of life, and though he were crucified through weaknesse, yet he liveth by the power of God. By this resurrection from the dead, he was declared to be the Son of God, and upon the morning of the third day did

2 Tim. 2. 8.

2 Cor. 13. 4.

Rom. 1. 4.

thoſe

those words of the Father manifest a most important truth, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* In his death he assured us of his humanity, by his resurrection he demonstrated his divinity.

Secondly, by the Resurrection we are assured of the justification of our persons, and if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead it will be imputed to us for righteousness: For he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. By his death we know that he suffered for sin, by his resurrection we are assured that the sinnes for which he suffered were not his own: had no man bin a sinner he had not dyed; had he bin a sinner he had not risen again: but dying for those sinnes which we committed, he rose from the dead to shew that he had made full satisfaction for them, that we believing in him might obtain remission of our sinnes and justification of our persons. *a God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinfull flesh for sin condemned sin in the flesh,* and raising up our surety from the prison of the grave, did actually abolve, and apparently acquit him from the whole obligation, to which he had bound himself, and in discharging him acknowledged full satisfaction made for us. *Who then shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that dyed, yea rather that is risen again.*

Thirdly, it was necessary to pronounce the Resurrection of Christ as an Article of our faith, that thereby we might ground, confirm, strengthen and declare our hope. *For the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled.* By the Resurrection of Christ his Father hath bin said to have begotten him; and therefore by the same he hath begotten us, who are called brethren and co-heirs with Christ. *For if*

Y y 2

when

Act. 13. 33.

Rom. 2. 24, 25.

† S. Chrysostome excellently upon this place, Ορα πως τήν αϊτίαν τῶν πᾶν τῷ θανάτῳ, τήν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀποδείξιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ποιῶν. Διὰ τί γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη, φησὶν. ὅτι οἱ καὶ ἀν' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀλλοτρίων ἐναντίας. οἱ γὰρ ἦν ἀμάρτωλος, πῶς ἀθέτης οἱ γὰρ ἀθεῖς, εὐδολογῶν ὅτι ἀμάρτωλος ἔκ' ἦν. οἱ γὰρ ἀμάρτωλος ἔκ' ἦν, πῶς ἐσταυρώθη; δι' ἑτέρους οἱ γὰρ δι' ἑτέρους, πῶς ἀθεῖς.

a Rom 8. 3.

1 Pet. 1. 3.

- Rom. 5. 10. *For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. He laid down his life, but it was for us; and being to take up his own, he took up ours. We are the members of that body of which Christ is the head; if the Head be risen, the members cannot be far behind. He is the*
- Col. 1. 18. *first born from the dead, and we the sonnes of the Resurrection. The Spirit of Christ abiding in us maketh us the*
- Rom. 8. 11. *members of Christ, and by the same spirit we have a full right and title to rise with our head. For if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us. Thus the Resurrection of Christ is the cause of our resurrection by a double causality, as an Efficient, and as an Exemplary cause. As an Efficient cause, in regard our Saviour by and upon his resurrection hath obtained power and right to raise all the dead; For as in Adam all dye, so in Christ shall all be made alive. As an Exemplary cause, in regard that all the Saints of God shall rise after the similitude and in conformity to the resurrection of Christ; For if we have bin*
- 1 Cor. 15. 22. *planted together in the likenesse of his death, we shall be also in the likenesse of his resurrection. He shall change our*
- Rom. 6. 5. *vile bodies that they may be like unto his glorious body: That as we have born the image of the earth we may also bear the image of the heavenly. This is the great hope of a Christian, that Christ rising from the dead hath obtain'd the power and is become the pattern of his resurrection. The*
- Philip. 3. 21. *breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and have passed through the gate, their King shall passe before them, and the Lord on the head of them.*
- 1 Cor. 15. 49. *Fourthly, it is necessary to profess our faith in Christ risen from the dead, that his Resurrection may effectually work it's proper operation on our lives. For as it is efficient and exemplary to our bodies, so it is also to our souls.*
- Ephes. 2. 5. *When we are dead in sinnes, God quickneth us together with Christ,*

Christ. And, as Christ was raised up from the dead by the Rom. 6. 4.
 glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newnesse of life.
 To continue among the graves of sin while Christ is risen,
 is to incurre that reprehension of the Angel, *why seek ye
 the living among the dead?* To walk in any habituall sin,
 is either to deny that sin is death, or Christ is risen from
 the dead. Let then *the dead bury the dead*, but let not any
 Christian bury him who rose from death that he might
 live. *Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead,* Eph. 5. 14. 3
and Christ shall give thee light. There must be a spiritu-
 all resurrection of the soul before there can be a comforta-
 ble resurrection of the body. *Blessed and holy is he that hath*
part in this first resurrection, on such the second death hath Revelar. 20. 6.
no power.

Having thus explained the manner of Christs resurrection,
 and the necessity of our faith in him risen from the
 dead, we may easily give such a brief account as any Chri-
 stian may understand what it is he should intend when he
 makes profession of this part of his Creed; for he is con-
 ceived to acknowledge thus much, I freely and fully as-
 sent unto this as a truth of infinite certainty and absolute
 necessity, that the eternall Son of God, who was crucified
 and dyed for our sinnes; did not long continue in the state
 of death, but by his infinite power did revive and raise
 himself by reuniting the same soul which was separated to
 the same body which was buried, and so rose the same
 man: and this he did the third day from his death; so
 that dying on Friday the sixth day of the week, the day of
 the preparation of the Sabbath, and resting in the grave
 the Sabbath day, on the morning of the first day of the
 week he returned unto life again, and thereby consecrated
 the weekly revolution of that first day to a religious ob-
 servation untill his coming again. And thus I believe *the
 third day he rose again from the dead.*

ARTICLE VI.

HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN,
AND SITTETH ON THE RIGHT
HAND OF GOD THE FATHER AL-
MIGHTY.

† Ascendit in
cœlos, sedet ad
dextram Patris.
Ruffinus in

Symb. S. Aug.
in Enchirid.

Maximus Tau-
rin. Chrysol.

Author Expos.
Symb. ad Cate-

cume os, Ve-
nantius Fortu-

natus, the Lat.
and Greek Mss.

set forth by the
Archbishop of

Armagh. S. Au-
gust. de Fide

Symb. hath it,
Sedet ad dex-

tram Dei Pa-
tris; to which

was afterwards
added Omni-

potentis. Sedet
ad dextram Pa-

tris omnipotē-
tis, Euseb. Gal-

lican. Sedet ad
dextram Dei

Patris omniipo-

tentis, Etherius
Uxam. & Au-

thor Sermonū
de Tempore,

the Greek and
Lat. Mss. in

Bennet Colledge
Library.

THis Article hath received no variation, but onely in the addition of the name of *God*, and the attribute *Almighty*; the † Ancients using it briefly thus, *He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father*. It containeth two distinct parts: one transient, the other permanent; one as the way the other as the end; the first is Christs Ascension, the second is his Session.

In the Ascension of Christ these words of the Creed propound unto us three considerations and no more: the first of the Person, *He*; the second of the Action, *ascended*; the third of the Termination, *into heaven*. Now the Person being perfectly the same which we have considered in the precedent Articles, he will afford no different speculation but onely in conjunction with this particular Action. Wherefore I conceive these three things necessary and sufficient for the illustration of Christs Ascension: First, to shew that the promised *Messias* was to ascend into heaven; secondly, to prove that our Jesus, whom we believe to be the true *Messias*, did really and truly ascend thither; thirdly, to declare what that heaven is, into which he did ascend.

That the promised *Messias* should ascend into heaven, hath bin represented typically, and declar'd prophetically. The High Priest under the law was an expresse type of the *Messias* and his Priestly office; the atonement which he made was the representation of the propitiation in Christ for the finnes of the world: for the making

this atonement, the High Priest was appointed once every year to enter into the Holy of holies; and no oftner. For the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the Holy place within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the Ark, that he dye not. None entered into that holy place but the High Priest alone; and he himself could enter thither but once in the year; and thereby shewed that the High Priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands, was to enter into the Holy place, having obtained eternall redemption for us. The Jews did all † believe that the Tabernacle did signifie this world, and the Holy of holies the highest heavens; wherefore as the High Priest did slay the sacrifice, and with the blood thereof did passe through the rest of the Tabernacle, and with that blood enter into the Holy of holies; so was the *Messias* here to offer up himself, and being slain to passe through all the courts of this world below, and with his blood to enter into the highest heavens the most glorious seat of the Majesty of God. Thus Christs Ascension was represented typically.

Lev. 16. 2.

Heb. 9. 11, 12.

† Εἰς τῆς σκηνῆς κατανέ-
ησθε τὴν πύ-
ξιν, καὶ τὴν ἱερῆς.
ἰδὴ τὴν σολὴν
τὰ τε σκαυή-
οις ἐπὶ τὴν ἱε-
ραρχίαν ἡρώ-
δα, τὴν το νο-
μοθέτην εὐρύ-
σας θεῖον ἀνδρα,
καὶ ματαίως ἡ-
μᾶς ὑποδύσθαι

ὡς ταῖς βλασφημίαις ἀκούοντες. ἔκαστα δὲ τούτων εἰς ὑπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπω-
σιν ἡρώδων, οἷσις ἀφ' ὧν εἰδὲται καὶ μετὰ σωτέρας σκοπεῖν, εὐρύσας ἡρώ-
δων τὴν τε δὲ σκηνὴν τεύχοντα πύξιν ὅσων νόμιμας εἰς Ἱερὰ, καὶ δι' ὅ μέρη
αὐτῆς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ὡς περὶ Βέβηλόν πνα καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, τὴν γὰρ καὶ τὴν
ἐκείνων ὑποποσημαίνε· καὶ δὲ ταῦτα πᾶσιν ὅτιν ἐπίβατα. τὴν δὲ τρίτῃ μοί-
ρῃ μὲν ἀνέγραφε τὸ Θεῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν ἕρανδον ἀνέπιβατον εἶναι ἀνδρά-
νιν. where it is to be observed, that the place which S. Paul calls the first taberna-
cle, Josephus termes βέβηλόν τινα καὶ κοινὸν τόπον, a common and profane place,
representing this world in which we live, and our life and conversation here: as the
apostle seems to speak, Heb. 9. 1. Εἰς ἧν οὐκ καὶ ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ διανομήματα λα-
οῦ καὶ τὸ το ἥριον κοσμικόν. For ἥριον κοσμικόν, sanctum seculare, or as the
Hebrew words נְדָבָה נְדָבָה domus sancta mundana, may well be that part of the
tabernacle which represented this world, and therefore termed common and pro-
fane in respect of that more holy part which represented heaven.

The same Ascension was also declar'd prophetically, as

we

Pfal. 68. 18.

This place must necessarily be understood of the Messias, by reason of that high place to which no other conquerour ascended. For that לָמְרוֹם *in the language of the Prophet is attributed to God, as Psal. 7. 8:* שׁוּבוּ לָמְרוֹם, *return on high, that is in the language of the Chaldee*

Parabrase,

לְבֵי שְׁכֵנְתְּךָ חַיִּים, *return to the house of thy majesty; and Psalm 93. 4:* אֲדוֹר בְּמִרְוֵה יְהוָה, *the Lord on high is mighty, Chald. נִשְׁמַי מְרוֹמָא, in the upper heavens. Psalm. 71. 19. Thy righteousness, O Lord, is* עַד שְׁמַי מְרוֹמָא *ad excelsum; the Chald. again, נִשְׁמַי מְרוֹמָא. In the same manner in this place, עָלִיתָ לָמְרוֹם, thou hast ascended on high, the Chaldee Parabrase translates לְרִקְיעַ סִלְקָתָא thou hast ascended the firmament: and he adds immediately מִשָּׁה נְבִיאָא thou prophet Moses: yet there is a plain contradiction in this interpretation; for if it were meant of Moses, it cannot be the firmament; if it were the firmament it cannot be understood of Moses, for he never ascended thither.*

* *This breaker up is by the confession of the Jews the title of the Messias. So the Author of Sepher Abchath Ruchal in his description of the coming of the Messias makes use of this place. And the same appeareth further by that saying of Moses Haddarshan in Bereshit Rabba, נִשְׁעָרָה מִלְמַטָּה זֶה אַבְרָהָם נִשְׁעָרָה מִלְמַעְלָה זֶה מֹשֶׁה וְנִשְׁעָרָה מִלְמַטָּה זֶה מְשִׁיחַ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל The plantation from below is Abram, the plantation from above is Messias, as it is written, The breaker is come up before them, &c. So he on Gen. 40. 9. Again the same Bereshit Rabba Gen. 44. 18. מִתְּחִיל הָיוּ הַיָּדָיו עַל הָרֹאשׁ וְעַתָּה הָיוּ עַל הַלְּבָבִים when shall we rejoice? when the feet of the Shecinah shall stand upon the mount of Olives; and again, מִתְּחִיל הָיוּ הַיָּדָיו עַל הָרֹאשׁ וְעַתָּה הָיוּ עַל הַלְּבָבִים when shall we rejoice? when the captives shall ascend from Hell, and Shecinah in the head, as it is written (Mic. 2. 13.) Their King shall passe before them, and the Lord in the head of them.*

Secondly,

Secondly, whatsoever was thus represented and fore-
 told of the promised *Messias*, was truly and really per-
 formed by our Jesus. That onely begotten and eternall
 Son of God, who by his divinity was present in the hea-
 vens while he was on earth, did by a locall translation
 of his humane nature, really and truly ascend from this
 earth below on which he lived, into the heavens a-
 bove, or rather above all the heavens, in the same body,
 and the soul, with which he liv'd and dyed and rose
 again.

The Ascension of Christ into heaven was not metaphori-
 call or figurative, as if there were no more to be under-
 stood by it, but onely that he obtained a more heavenly
 and glorious state or condition after his Resurrection. For
 whatsoever alteration was made in the body of Christ
 when he rose, whatsoever glorious qualities it was inve-
 sted with thereby, that was not his Ascension, as appeareth
 by those words which he spake to *Mary*, *Touch me not;* Joh. 20. 17.
for I am not yet ascended to my Father. Although he had
 said before to *Nicodemus*, *No man hath ascended up to hea-* Joh. 3. 13.
ven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of
man which is in heaven; which words imply that he had
 then ascended: yet even those concern not this Ascension.
 For that was therefore onely true, because the Son of man,
 not yet conceived in the Virgins womb, was not in heaven,
 and after his conception by virtue of the hypostaticall uni-
 on was in heaven; from whence speaking after the manner
 of men, he might well say, that he had ascended into hea-
 ven; because whatsoever was first on earth and then in hea-
 ven we say ascended into heaven. Wherefore beside that
 grounded upon the hypostaticall union, beside that glori-
 ous condition upon his Resurrection, there was yet another
 and that more proper Ascension: for after he had both
 those wayes ascended, it was still true that he had not yet
 ascended to his Father.

Now this kind of Ascension, by which Christ had not

Z z z

yet

yet ascended when he spake to *Mary* after his resurrection; was not long after to be performed; for at the same time he said unto *Mary*, *Goe to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father.* And when this Ascension was performed, it appeared manifestly to be a true locall translation of the Son of man as man from these parts of the world below into the heavens above, by which that body which was before locally present here on earth, & was not so then present in heaven, became substantially present in heaven, and no longer locally present in earth. For *when he had spoken unto the Disciples, and blessed them*, laying his hands upon them, and so was corporally present with them, *even while he blessed them he parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight*, and so he was carried up into heaven, while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up. This was a visible departure, as it is described, a reall removing of that body of Christ which was before present with the Apostles, and that body living after the Resurrection, by virtue of that soul which was united to it and therefore the Son of God according to his humanity was really and truly translated from these parts below unto the heavens above, which is a proper locall ascension.

Thus was Christs Ascension visibly performed in the presence and sight of the Apostles, for the confirmation of the reality and the certainty thereof. † They did not see him when he rose, but they saw him when he ascended; because an eye witness was not necessary unto the act of his Resurrection, but it was necessary unto the act of his Ascension. It was sufficient that Christ *showed himself* to the Apostles *alive after his passion*; for being they knew him before to be dead, and now saw him alive, they were thereby assured that he rose again: for whatsoever was a proof of his life after death, was a demonstration of his resurrection. But being the Apostles were not to see our Saviour

LUC. 24. 50, 51.

Act. 1. 9, 10.

† Βλαπτόντων
 μὴ ἐκ ἀνέστη,
 βλαπτόντων ᾧ
 ἐπαύρη· ἐπαύ-
 ρει· ὡς ταῦτα ἡ
 ὁψις τὸ παῖ
 ἰσχυρὰ· καὶ γὰρ
 ἀναστάσις τὸ
 μὴ τέλει· ἔτι
 δὲ, τὴν ᾧ ἀρ-
 χὴν ἐκ· καὶ
 τῆς ἀναλήψε-
 ως τὴν μὴ ἀρ-
 χὴν ἢ δὲ, τὸ ᾧ
 τέλει· ἐκ· καὶ
 παρῆλκε γὰρ ἡ
 κήρυξ τὸ τὴν
 ἀρχὴν ἰδῆν,
 αὐτὴ τὴν ταῦτα
 φθιγμένην πα-
 ρέει· καὶ οὖν
 μαθήματα δι-
 δούται· ὅτι
 ἐκ· ἔστιν ἐκ·
 ὁ δὲ τὸ μετα-
 σῆμα λόγος ἰδῆ
 μαθεῖν, S.
 Chrys. Hom. 2.
 ἐκ· Ἀπὸ Ἀποστ.

in heaven, being the session was not to be visible to the Apostles on earth, therefore it was necessary they should be eye witnesses of the act who were not with the same eyes to behold the effect.

Beside the eye witness of the Apostles, there was added the testimony of the Angels; those blessed Spirits which ministred before, and saw the face of God in heaven, and came down from thence, did know that Christ ascended up from hence unto that place from whence they came: and because the eyes of the Apostles could not follow him so far, the inhabitants of that place did come to testify of his reception; For behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him goe into heaven. We must therefore acknowledge and confesse against all the wild Heresies of old, that the eternall Son of God who dyed and rose again, did with the same body and soul, with which he dyed and rose, ascend up to heaven; which was the second Particular considerable in this Article.

† Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκ
ἀρχῆς οἱ ὁ
δαλμοὶ δειξά
τὸ ὕψος, ἡ δὲ
παιδεύουσα π
περὶ οὓς τὸν
ἕρανδον ἀνῆλ
θεν ἡ ὥς οἱς ἔ
ἕρανδον, ὅρα τί
γινεῖ. ὅτι ὁ
αὐτὸς ὅστις Ἰη
σοῦς ἡ ἀληθὴς
ὧν διελέγετο
πρὸς αὐτοὺς

Thirdly, (πρόβλεπεν γὰρ

αὐτοὶ λοιπὸν
αὐτὸν ἰδόντας γινώσκαι) ὅτι ὁ εἰς τὸν ἕρανδον ἀναλαμβάνεται, αὐτοὶ λοιπὸν
αὐτὸν ἰδόντας γινώσκαι, S. Chrys. Hom. 2. in Acta Apost.

The various Heresies in the Primitive times concerning the humanity of Christ ascended into heaven are briefly touched by Tertullian; Ut & illi erubescant, qui adfirmant carnem in cœlis vacuum sensu ut vaginam exempto Christo sedere, aut quæ carnem & animam tantundem, aut tantummodo animam, carnem vero non jam, carne Christi, cap. 24. Of which Gregory Nazianzene, Εἰ τις ἄποθεθεὶς τὴν σάρκα λέγει, καὶ θυμὸν τὴν θεότητα σώματι, ὅτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνελκυσματὸς καὶ τὴν ἕραν, καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν ἀνάστασιν τῆς παρουσίας, Epist. 1. ad Cledonium. The Apellites taught that Christ left his body dissolved in the air, and ascended into heaven without it; Hunc Apellem dicunt quidam etiam de Christo falsa sensisse, ut dice et eum non quidem carnem duxisse de cœlo, sed ex elementis mundi accepisse, quæ mundo redidit, cum sine carne resurgens in cœlum ascendit, S. Aug. Hæres. 23. This opinion of Apelles is thus delivered by Epiphanius in these words, Ἐν τῷ ἕρανδῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπερανίου ἡλθεν εἰς τὴν γλῶσσαν καὶ σωθήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ τεσσάρων στοιχείων σώμα. Ἐδωκεν ὁ Χεῖρδης αὐτὸν ὡς αὐτὸς τὸ σώματι, καὶ ἐσαυρώθη ὡς ἀληθεῖα, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τὴν σάρκα

κα τοῖς αὐτοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ ἀναλῦσαι αὐτὴν τὴν ἐκείνην ἑαυτῇ ἀποδεῖ-
 σαι πάλιν ἐκ τῶν τοιχείων τὸ ἴδιον ὑποδύς, τὸ θορυβῶν τὸ θορυβῶν, τὸ ὑ-
 γρῶν τὸ ὑγρῶν, τὸ ξηρῶν τὸ ξηρῶν, τὸ ὑγρῶν τὸ ὑγρῶν. καὶ ὅπως διαλύσαι
 ἀπ' αὐτῆς πάλιν τὸ ἑσπεριον σῶμα ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ὅθεν καὶ ἦκα. *Heb.*
 44. *Of w^{om} Gregory Nazianzen is to be understood in that Epistle before cited,*
*ἢ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ἐχέθη καὶ διήλυσεν, ὡς φανῆς φύσις, καὶ ὁδμῆς φύσις, καὶ ἀσπασ-
 ῖν δρόμῳ ἔχ' ἰσαυδῆς.*

Thirdly, being the name of *heaven* admitteth divers
 acceptions in the sacred Scriptures, it will be necessary to
 enquire what is the true Notion of it in this Article, and
 what was the proper termination of Christs Ascension. In
 some sense it might be truly said Christ was in heaven be-
 fore the cloud took him out of the Apostles sight; for the
 clouds themselves are call'd the clouds of heaven: but that
 heaven is the first; and our Saviour certainly ascended at
 least as far as *S. Paul* was caught up, that is, into the third
 heaven; For *we have a great High Priest that is passed*
 † *through the heavens.* And needs must he passe through
 the heavens, because he was *a made higher then the hea-*
vens; For *b he that descended is the same also that ascen-*
ded up far above all heavens. When therefore Christ is
 said to have ascended into heaven, we must take that word
 as signifying as much as the heaven of heavens, and so
 Christ is ascended through and above the heavens, and yet
 is still in heaven; for he is *entred into that within the veil,*
 there is his passage through the heavens: *into the holy place,*
even into heaven it self to appear in the presence of God; this
 is the heaven of heavens. For *thus said the Lord, the hea-*
ven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; and as
 Christ descended unto the footstool of his Father in his hu-
 miliation, so he ascended unto the throne of his Father in
 his exaltation. This was the place of which our Saviour
 spake to his Disciples, *What and if ye shall see the son of*
man ascend up where he was before? Had he bin there be-
 fore in body it had bin no such wonder that he should have
 ascended thither again: but that his body should ascend

Heb. 4. 14.
 † *We read it*
indeed into the
heavens, but the
Originall im-
ports as much
as through, δι-
ενηλυτό τε
τὸς οὐρανός,
Vulg. qui pene-
travit cœlos.
a Heb. 7. 26.
b Eph. 4. 10.
Heb. 6. 19.

Heb. 9. 12, 26.

unto that place where the Majesty of God was most resplendent; that the flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone should be seated far above all Angels and Archangels, all principalities and powers, even at the right hand of God; this was that which Christ propounded as worthy of their greatest admiration. Whatsoever heaven then is higher than all the rest which are called heavens; whatsoever sanctuary is holier than all which are called holies; whatsoever place is of greatest dignity in all those courts above, in that place did he ascend, where in the splendor of his Deity he was before he took upon him our humanity.

As therefore when we say Christ ascended, we understand a literall and locall ascent, not of his Divinity, (which possesseth all places, and therefore being every where is not subject to the imperfection of removing any whither) but of his humanity, which was so in one place that it was not in another: so when we say the place into which he ascended was heaven, and from the expositions of the Apostles must understand thereby the heaven of heavens or the highest heaven, it followeth that we believe the body with the soul of Christ to have passed far above all those celestiall bodies which we see, and to look upon that opinion as a low conceit which left his body in the

† The Seleucia-
ni and Hermia-
ni taught that
the body of
Christ ascended
no further then

the Sun, in which it was deposited; of whom Philastrius, and out of him S. Austin thus, *Negant Salvatorem in carne sedere ad dextram Patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent, eamque in Sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de Psalmo, In Sole posuit Tabernaculum suum, Heret. 59. The same opinion Gregory Nazianzen attributeth to the Manicheans, Περὶ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, οἱ μὴ μὲν αὐτὸ προσλαβόντες; ἡ γὰρ δὲ καὶ τὸς Μανιχαίων λόγος πρὸς ἡμῶν ἀναποτίδεται ἵνα τιμωρὴν διὰ τῆς ἀτιμίας, Epist. 1. ad Cledonium. And S. Austin says they taught the Sun to be Christ, Manichæi Solem istum oculis carnis visibilem, expositum & publicum, non tantum hominibus sed etiam pecoribus ad videndum, Christum Dominum esse putarunt, Tract. 34. in Joh. This opinion is more clearly set down, but without a name, in the Carena Patrum on the 18. Psalm, Οὐ γὰρ προσεκτίον τοῖς ἡσυχασταῖς φιλωμένοις, οἱ φασιν ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἐν ἡννιακῇ σφαίρᾳ ἀπέθετο ὃ ἐφόρησε σῶμα, φυλάττειν μέχρι τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας. This was the old Heresie of Hermogenes, as is related by Theodoret, Οὐτὸς (ὁ Ἑρμογένης) ἡγεῖται τὸ σῶμα ἐν πρὸς ἡμῶν ἔσθαι σποταθῆναι, τὸν δὲ διαβολὸν καὶ τὸς δαιμοναγῶν τὸν ἡλίου ἀναχέειν, Heret. Fab. l. i. c. 19.*

ZZZ 3

12

It was necessary to professe this Article of Christs Ascension first for the confirmation and augmentation of our Faith. Our Faith is thereby confirm'd, in that we believe in him who is received unto the Father and therefore certainly came from the Father; his Father sent him, and we have received the message from him, and are assured that it is the same message which he was sent to deliver, because he is so highly rewarded by him that sent him for delivering it. Our Faith is thereby exalted and augmented, as being *the evidence of things not seen*. The further the Object is removed from us, the more of [†] faith hath that act which embraceth it. Christ said unto *Thomas*, *a because thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed*: and that blessedness by his Ascension he hath left to the whole Church. Thus Christ ascended is the ground and the glory of our faith; and by virtue of his being in heaven our belief is both encouraged and commended; for his ascent is the cause, and his absence the crown of our faith; because he ascended we the more believe, and because we believe in him who hath ascended, our faith is the more accepted.

Heb. 11. 1.

† Magnarum hic vigor est mentium, & valde fidelium lumen est animarum, incunctanter credere quæ corporeo non videntur intuitu, & ibi figere desiderium quo nequeas inferre conspectum.

Hæc autem pietas unde in nostris cordibus nasceretur, aut quomodo quisquam justificaretur per fidem, si in iis tantum salus nostra consisteret quæ obtutibus subjacerent? *Leo de Ascen. Serm. 2.* Fides eorum qui Deum visuri sunt, quamdiu peregrinantur corda mundantur, quod non vi et credit, nam si vides non est fides: credenti colligitur meritum, videnti redditur præmium. Eat ergo Dominus & parat locum; eat ne videatur, lateat ut credatur: tunc enim locus paratur, si ex fide vivatur: creditus desideretur ut desideratus habeatur: desiderium dilectionis præparatio est mansionis, *S. Aug. Tract. 68. in Joh.* & *Joh. 10. 29.*

† Christi ascensio nostra pro-
vectio est; &
quo præcessit
gloria capitis,
eo spes vocatur
& corporis
*Leo de Ascen.
Serm. 1.*

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Ascension of Christ for the corroboration of our hope. We could never expect our dust and ashes should ascend the heavens; but being our nature hath gone before in him, we can now hope to follow after him. He is our head, and where that is, the members may expect admission: for in so great and intimate an union there is no fear of separation or exclusion,

du from There are many mansions in his Fathers house. And Joh. 14. 3. when he spake of ascending thither, he said expressly to his Disciples, I go to prepare a place for you, and will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also. The † first fruits of our nature are ascended, and the rest is sanctified. a This is the new and living way which he consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh. And hence we have our hope as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, which entred into that with in the vail, whither the forerunner is for us entred. For if Christ in his ascension be the forerunner, then are there some to follow after; and not only so, but they which follow are to goe in the same way, and to attain unto the same place: and if this forerunner be entred for us, then we are they which are to follow and to overtake him

† Διὰ τὸτο εὐρυ-
τάζην ὁρεῖλο-
μῶ ἐπὶ τῷ σῶ-
μερὸν τῷ ἀ-
παρχῶ τῷ ἡ-
μετέρῳ θυρῶ-
ματὶ, τὴν ἐν-
τὴν σάρκα, ὅν ἡ-
ρανοῖς Χριστὸς
αἰνῶμα, S.
Chryl. Orat. 1.
de Ascens. Διδ-
λοῖπὸν Χριστὸς

ἔρχεται τὰς ἡπίδας πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀπαρχὴν ἀφορῶντες, Ibid. Orat. 2. a Heb. 10. 10. b Heb. 6. 19, 20. There is a double notion of πρὸς εἰς in this pu pose, one of a man sent before to make preparations for others which follow; in w^hich it is well observed by S. Chryl. Ὁ ὅς πρὸς εἰς τινῶν ὅτι πρὸς εἰς, ὡς πρὸς Ἰωάννης τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ ἡμετέραν ἀπαρχὴν εἰσὶν ἡμετέραν. ὅτι ὅπου πρὸς εἰς ἡμετέραν, ὡς καὶ ἡμετέραν ὁφθαλμῶν κατὰ λαβεῖν. Οὐ πολὺ γὰρ τῷ πρὸς εἰς καὶ τῷ ἐπομένῳ ὁφθαλμῷ τὸ μέσον ἐπὶ ἡμῶν εἰν πρὸς εἰς. τὸν γὰρ πρὸς εἰς καὶ τὸς ἐπομένους ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ χερὶ εἶν ὁ δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὸ δὲ εἶν, τὸς ὅτι κατὰ λαμβάνειν, Hom. 11. in Epist. ad Hebræos. Another notion there is among the Greeks of the fruit which is ripe and come to perfection before the rest, as Isaiah 28. 4 Καὶ ἔσται τὸ ἀνθὸς τὸ ὀκταεὶς οὐκ ἐλπίδος καὶ δόξης ἐπ' ἀχρὺ τῷ ὄρει ὡς πρὸς εἰς οὐκ, ΠΡΩΤΟΓΕΝΗΣ, tan- quam primitivæ, or fructus primogeniti, ficus præcox. Hesychius, Πρὸς εἰς, τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀξονι ξύλα, ἢ τὰ πρὸς εἰς οὐκ, lege Πρὸς εἰς, for they in- deed are properly τὰ πρὸς εἰς οὐκ, præcozes ficus: For so Theophrastus speaking particularly ἐπὶ Συκῆς, has these words, ὑπολαμπόμενης γὰρ πλείους τῆς πλείους ὑπερβόης, ὅταν αἴθρῃ ὀκταεὶς καὶ ὑγρὸς καὶ θερμὸς, ἐξεκαλέ- σται τῷ βλάστησιν. ὅτι ὅτι τὸ συμβαίνει φανερόν, ὅτι ὅτι τῷ μέγιστον ὁ καρ- πὸς αἰστανται, ὅταν καὶ οἱ πρὸς εἰς, De causis Plant. l. 5. c. 1. & paulo post, Πά- λιν ὅτι τὸς πρὸς εἰς αἰ μὲν φέρουσιν, ὅτι, ἢ τε Λακωνικὴ καὶ Λακωνοφάλας καὶ ἡ- τῶν αἰστανται, αἰ δὲ ὅτι φέρουσιν. The first fruits of the early figs were called πρὸς εἰς and the tree which bare them πρὸς εἰς. Now as this early fruit doth overun the lat- ter fruit of the same tree, and comes to ripeness and perfection in its kind before the rest; so our Saviour goes before those men of the same nature with him, and they follow in their time to the maturity of the same perfection.

there;

Eph. 2. 6.

† Τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς
καθ' ὁμοκτίτης
τὸ σῶμα συ-
καθ' ἡμᾶς διὰ
τοῦτο πῆρα ἡμᾶς,
ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰη-
σοῦ, S. Chrys. in
locum.

there; as being of the same nature, members of the same body, branches of the same vine, and therefore he went thither before us as the first fruits before those that follow, and we hope to follow him as coming late to the same perfection. As therefore *God hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together* by virtue of his resurrection; so also hath he *made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*, by virtue of his ascension. We are already seated there † in him, and hereafter shall be seated by him; in him already as in our head, which is the ground of our hope; by him hereafter, as by the cause conferring, when hope shall be swallowed up into fruition.

Mat. 6. 21.

Joh. 12. 32.

2 Kings 2. 2.

Col. 3. 1, 2, 3.

1 Pet. 2. 11.

Phil. 3. 19, 20.

Ephes. 2. 19.

Thirdly, the profession of faith in Christ ascended is necessary for the exaltation of our affections. *For where our treasure is, there will our hearts be also. If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me*, saith our Saviour; and if those words were true of his crucifixion, how powerfull ought they to be in reference to his ascension? *When the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven, Elisha said unto him, As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not leave thee*; when Christ is ascended up on high, we must follow him with the wings of our meditations and with the chariots of our affections. *If we be risen with Christ, we must seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. If we be dead, and our life hid in Christ with God, we must set our affection on things above, not on things on the earth.* Christ is ascended into heaven to teach us, that we are strangers and pilgrims here as all our fathers were, and that another countrey belongs unto us: from whence we as *strangers and pilgrims* should learn to abstain from fleshly lusts, and not mind earthly things, as knowing that we are *citizens of heaven, from whence we look for our Saviour, the Lord Jesus, yea fellow-citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God,* We should trample upon

our

our finnes, and subdue the lusts of the flesh, that our conversation may be correspondent to our Saviours condition; that where the eyes of the Apostles were forced to leave him, thither our thoughts may follow him.

Fourthly, the Ascension of Christ is a necessary Article of the Creed in respect of those great effects which immediately were to follow it, and did absolutely depend upon it. The blessed Apostles had never preached the Gospel, had they not bin indued with power from above; but none of that power had they received, if the Holy Ghost in a miraculous manner had not descended: And the Holy Ghost had not come down, except our Saviour had ascended first. For he himself when he was to depart from his Disciples, grounded the necessity of his departure upon the certainty of this truth, saying, *If I goe not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you.* Now if all the infallibility of those truths, which we as Christians believe, depend upon the certain information which the Apostles had, and those Apostles appear to be no way infallible till the cloven tongues had sit upon them, it was first absolutely necessary that the Holy Ghost should so descend. Again, being it was impossible that the Spirit of God in that manner should come down, untill the Son of God had ascended into heaven; being it was not fit that the second Advocate should officiate on earth, till the first Advocate had entered upon his office in heaven; therefore in respect of this great work the Son of God must necessarily ascend, and in reference to that necessity we may well be obliged to confesse that Ascension.

Upon these considerations we may easily conclude what every Christian is obliged to confesse in those words of our Creed, *He ascended into heaven*: for thereby he is understood to expresse thus much, I am fully perswaded, that the onely begotten and eternall Son of God, after he rose from the dead, did with the same soul and body with

A a a a which

which he rose, by a true and locall translation convey himself from the earth on which he liv'd, through all the regions of the air, through all the celestiaall Orbs, untill he came unto the heaven of heavens, the most glorious presence of the Majesty of God. And thus I believe, in Jesus Christ who *ascended into heaven*.

AND SITTETH ON THE RIGHT
HAND OF GOD THE FATHER AL-
MIGHTY.

THis second part of the Article containeth two Particulars; the Session of the Son, and the Description of the Father: the first sheweth that Christ upon his ascension is set down *at the right hand of God*: the second assur-eth us that the God, at whose right hand Christ is set down, is the *Father Almighty*.

For the explication of Christs Session, three things will be necessary; First, to prove that the promised *Messias* was to sit at the right hand of God; Secondly, to shew that our Jesus whom we believe to be the true *Messias* is set down at the right hand of God; Thirdly, to find what is the importance of that phrase, and in what propriety of expression it belongs to Christ.

That the promised *Messias* was to sit at the right hand of God, was both pretyfied and foretold. *Joseph* who was betrayed and sold by his brethren was an expresse type of Christ, and though in many things he represented the *Messias*, yet in none more then in this, that being taken out of the prison he was exalted to the supreme power of

Gen. 41. 40,
42, 43.

Egypt. For thus *Pharaoh* spake to *Joseph*, *Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled; only in the throne will I be greater then thou. And Pharaoh took off the ring from his hand, and put it*

Josephs band, and araid him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cryed before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the Land of Egypt. Thus Joseph had the execution of all the Regall power committed unto him, all edicts and commands were given out by him, the managing of all affairs was through his hands, onely the Authority by which he mov'd remain'd in Pharaoh still. This was a clear representation of the Son of man, who by his sitting on the right hand of God, obtained power to rule and govern all things both in heaven and earth (especially as the ruler of his house, that is, the Church,) with expresse command that all things, both in heaven, and earth, and under the earth, should bow down before him: but all this in the name of the Father; to whom the throne is still reserv'd, in whom the originall authority still remains. And thus the Session of the *Messias* was pretypified.

The same was also expressly foretold not onely in the psalm but in the phrase. The Lord said unto my Lord, saith the Prophet David, Sit thou at my right hand untill I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Jews have endeavoured to avoid this prophesie, but with no success: some make the person to whom God speaks to be † Ezechias, some † Abraham, some Zorobabel, others † David,

Psal. 110. 1.

† This Justine Martyr testifieth of the Jews in his age, Καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μὲν ὅτι εἰς τὸν Ἐξάρχην

το βασιλέα ἔην γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἐκ αὐτοῦ, ἐπεῖπον. Dialog. cum Tryphone. So S. Chrysostome speaks of the Jews, Τίνα οὐκ οἰκοῦντο τὸν ἀρχηγὸν φαίεσθαι; τὸν ὃ ἀκούοντα; † Ἀβραάμ. ἔτιροι ὃ † Ζοροβάβελ, καὶ ἄλλοι. ad loc. m. Ita Catena Græca, Cui ὃ Ἰσραήλ, ὃ Ζοροβάβελ, καὶ ἄλλοι. And this Exposition is now followed by Solomon Jarchi and Lipmannus. Jarchi acknowledging it to be ancient, דבוחינו דרשוהו באברהם אבינו ואנו אפרשנו כדבריהם וכן נאמר: This is the exposition of the later Rabbins, as

of Iben Ezra, and David Kimchi, who attribute the subject of the Psalm to David, and onely they, but the ancienter Rabbins since our Saviours time, as appeareth by the words of S. Chrysostome, Καὶ τὰ ἐπιδόκουντα ὃ δὲ λαὸς ὅτι ἐλέγχετο τὸν Ζοροβάβελ, καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν Δαβὶδ. ἡ δὲ ἰστορία αὐτῶν ἰσχυρῶς τετυμνωμένη.

ἢ Ἀλλὰ καὶ
πρὸς πᾶσι
τοῖς τούτοις
ἐκδοτέρας,
καὶ τὴν λαὸν λέ-
γοντες ταῦτα
οἰκιστῶν, & paul-
lo post, Πῶς
ἢ ἡ τοῦ Δαβὶδ,
ἢ τοῦ Ζοροβὰ-
βελ, ἢ τοῦ λαοῦ
ταῦτα ἀρμό-
σκει; S. Chry-
ostome.

* To which pur-
pose saith S.
Chrysostome,
concerning the
Jews of his
time, Τί γὰρ
φασιν ὁμοί-
ασι; ὅτι ὁ
παῖς τοῦ Ἀβρα-
άμ ταῦτα λέ-
γει καὶ τὸν Κυ-
εῖν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ.

∴ As for that
objection
which is made
by Aben-Ezra,
that it is not
the Psalm of
David, but
pen'd for and
in the honour
of David, be-
cause the title is

ΨΑΛΜΟΣ ΔΑΒΙΔ, as if it were a Psalm for David, not of David: it
is by no means to be admitted; because it may not onely very well sig-
ify a Psalm made
by David; but if it doe not, there is no title which shewes any Psalm to be his. "Τὸ
ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου, Ζοροβὰβελ Κυεῖν τοῦ Δαβὶδ; καὶ πῶς αὐτὸς ἔχει λαόν, ὅς ἐστι αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ
μυριάδων πικρῶν Δαβὶδ κίλκων;" S. Chryl. ∴ This is the Argument which the Fathers
used against the Jews, as Iustine Martyr, in opposition to their pretence of Ezechias, "Ἰ-
σααὺς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες ἑξ ὅλων τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ μόνον αὐτοῦ
τοῦτον τὸν μῦθον, Diakum Tryphone; & so S. Chryl. in the words before mentioned.

others † the people of *Israel*; and because the Prophecie
cannot belong to him who made the Psalm, therefore they
which attribute the prediction to *Abraham*; tell us the
Psalm was pen'd by his * Steward *Eliezer*: they which
expound it of *David*, say that one of his Musicians was
Author of it. But first it is most certain that *David* was
the pen-man of this Psalm; the title speaks as much, which
is, ∴ A Psalm of *David*: from whence it followeth that
the prediction did not belong to him, because 'twas spo-
ken to his Lord. Nor could it indeed belong to any of the
rest which the *Jews* imagine, because neither *Abraham*,
nor *Ezechias*, nor " *Zorobabel* could be the Lord of
David, much lesse the people of *Israel* (to whom some of
the *Jews* referr'd it) who were not the Lords, but the sub-
jects of that *David*. Beside, he which is said to sit at the
right hand of God. is also said to be a Priest for ever af-
ter the order of *Melchizedek*; but neither *Abraham*, nor
Ezechias, nor any which the *Jews* have mention'd was e-
ver any ∴ Priest of God. Again, our Saviour urg'd this
Scripture against the Pharisees, saying, *What think ye of
Christ? whose Son is he? they say unto him, The Son of
David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in
Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy
footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?
And no man was able to answer him a word.* From whence
'tis evident that the *Jews* of old, even the Pharisees, the
most accurate and skillfull amongst them, did inter-
pret this Psalm of the *Messias*; for if they had conceiv'd

the

the prophesie belonged either to *Abraham*, or *David*, or any of the rest since mentioned by the *Jews*, they might very well, and questionlesse would have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of *David*. It was therefore the generall opinion of the Church of the *Jews* before our Saviour, and of divers † Rabbins since his death, that this prediction did concern the Kingdome of Christ. And thus the Session of the *Messias* at the right hand of God was not onely represented typically, but foretold prophetically : which is our first Consideration.

Secondly, we affirm, that our Jesus, whom we worship as the true *Messias*, according unto that particular prediction, when he ascended up on high, did sit down at the right hand of God. His Ascension was the way to his Session, and his Session the end of his Ascension; as the Evangelist expresseth it, *a He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God*; or as the Apostle, *God raised Christ from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places*. There could be no such Session without an Ascension; *b and David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thy feet thy footstool*. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, let all the blind and wilfull *Jews* be convinced of this truth, that God hath not set at his own right hand neither *Abraham* nor *David*, neither *Ezechias* nor *Zerubbabel*, but hath made that same Jesus whom they have crucified both Lord and Christ.

This was an honour never given, never promised, to any man but the *Messias*: the glorious Spirits stand about the throne of God, but never any of them set down at the right hand of God. For to which of his Angels said he at any time, *Sit on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footstool*. But Christ was so assured of this honour, that before the Council of the Chief Priests and Elders of the people, when he foresaw his death contrived,

† As in the Midrash Tilm. P/al. 18.

אר"י יודן 36.
בשר" חמא
לעזר הבה
מושב מלך
המשיח
ליומיו שנ"
נאם ו"
לאדני שב
ליומיו :

R. Joden in the name of Rabbi Chama said, that in the time to come God shall place Messias the King at his right hand, as it is written

(Psal. 110.1.) The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand.

a Mar. 16. 19.

b Act. 2. 34.

35, 36.

Heb. 1. 13.

Luc. 22. 69.

1 Pet. 3. 22.

and his Crosse prepared, even then he express'd the confidence of his expectation, saying, *Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.* And thus our Jesus, whom we worship as the true promised *Messias*, is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God. Which was our second Consideration.

† Credimus etiam quod sedet ad dextram Dei Patris. Nec ideo tamen quasi humana forma circumscriptum esse Deum Patrem arbitrandum est, ut de illo cogitantibus dextrum aut sinistrum latus animo occurrat, S. Aug. De Fine & Sy. b. * Succedunt brachia & validi lacertorum thori, validæ ad operandum manus, & proceribus digitis habiles ad tenendum: Hinc aptior usus o-

perandi, hinc scribendi elegantia, & ille calamus scribæ velociter scribentis, quo divinæ vocis exprimuntur oracula. Manus est quæ cibum ori ministrat; manus est quæ præclaris enitet factis, quæ conciliatrix divinæ gratiæ sacris inservit altaribus, per quam offerimus & sumimus sacramenta cœlestia. Manus est quæ operatur pariter atq; dispensat divina mysteria, cujus vocabulo nō dedignatus est se Dei Filius declarari, dicente David, *Dextra Domini exaltavit me.* Manus est quæ fecit omnia, sicut dixit Deus omnipotens, *Nonne manus mea fecit hæc?* S. Ambros. *Hexam. l. 6. c. 9.*

Again,

Again, because the most honourable place amongst men is the right hand (as when *Bathsheba* went unto King *Solomon*, he sate down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the Kings mother, and she sate on his right hand) therefore the right hand of God signifies the glorious majesty of God. 1 Kings 2. 19.

Thirdly, because the gifts of men are given and received by the hands of men, and every perfect gift comes from the Father of lights, therefore the right hand of God is the place of celestially happiness and perfect felicity; according to that of the Psalmist, *In thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand pleasures for evermore.*

Now as to the first acception of the right hand of God, Christ is said to sit down at the right hand of the Father in regard of that absolute power and dominion which he hath obtained in heaven; from whence it is expressly said, *Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power.* Mar. 27. 64. Mar. 14. 62. Luc. 22. 69.

As to the second acception, Christ is said to sit on the right hand of God in regard of that honour, glory, and Majesty which he hath obtained there; wherefore it is said, *When he had by himself purged our sinnes he sate down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:* and again, *We have an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens.* Heb. 1. 3. Heb. 8. 1.

In reference to the third acception Christ is said to sit on the right hand of God, because now after all the labours and sorrows of this world, after his stripes and buffeting, after a painfull and a shamefull death, he resteth above in unspeakable joy, and everlasting felicity. † *Ad dextram intelligendum et dictum esse in summa beatitudine, ubi iustitia & pax & gaudium est,*

As S. Aug. de Fide & Symb. Quid est Patris dextera, nisi illa aeterna ineffabilisque felicitas, quo pervenit Filius hominis, etiam carnis immortalitate percepta? Idem contra Sermonem Arrian. Beatus est & à beatitudine, quae dextera Patris vocatur; ipsius beatitudinis nomen est dextera Patris, De Symb. ad Galath. Salus temporalis

ralis & carnalis in sinistra est, salus æterna cum Angelis in dextra est. Ideo jam in ipsa immortalitate positus Christus dicitur sedere ad dextram Dei. Non enim Deus habet in seipso dextram aut sinistram; sed dextera Dei dicitur felicitas illa, quæ quoniam ostendi non potest tale nomen accepit, S. Aug. in Psalm. 137.

Rom. 8. 34.

1 Pet. 3. 22.

† Επει τὸ εἰ-
πὴν καὶ ἡδὺς
φορτικὸν αὐ-
τοῖς ἦν, τότε
τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ
κρίσεως κί-
νῃ λόγον καὶ
ἐπὶ αὐτὸν

† S. Chrys. Hom. 18 in Acta. Si major gratia & manifestatio intelligentia in Novo est quam in Veteri Testamento, quare Esaias Propheta sedentem in throno Majestatis vidit Deum Sabaoth, in Novo autem Stephanus primus Martyr stantem se vidisse ait Iesum à dextris Dei? Quid est istud, ut hic subjectus videatur post triumphos, & illic quasi dominus antequam vinceret? Prout causa erat fecisse, ita & Dominus se ostendit. Prophetæ enim visus est quasi rex corripiens plebem, & hoc se ostendit quod erat, hoc est, sedentem, in pace enim erat causa divinitatis ejus. Stephano autem u stans appareret fecit calumnia Judæorum. In Stephano autem Salvatoris causa vim patiebatur. Ideo sedente Judice Deo stans apparuit, quasi qui causam diceret; & quia bona causa ejus est, ad dextram Judicis erat; Omnis qui causam dicit, stes necesse est, S. Aug. Quasi. in Novum Test. 88. Sedere judicantis est, stare vero pugnantis vel adjuvantis. Stephanus ergo in labore certaminis positus, stantem vidit quem adiutorem habuit. Sed hunc post ascensionem Marcus sedere scribit, quia post ascensionis sue gloriam Iuxta in fine videbitur, Greg. Homil. 29. in Evang.

This

This phrase then to *sit*, prescinding from the corporall posture of Session, may signifie no more then habitation, possession, permanſion, and continuance; as the same word in the † *Hebrew*, and *Greek* languages often signifies. And thus our Saviour is set down at the right hand of God in heaven, because he which dwelt with us before on earth, is now ascended up into heaven, and hath taken his mansion or habitation there; and so hath he seated himself, and * dwelleth in the highest heavens.

† *שׁוּב* which properly signifieth to sit, as familiarly used for permanſit and habitavit; as Jud. 5. 17.

שׁוּב שׁוּב

שׁוּב שׁוּב, LXX' *Ἀσὴρ θαλάσσης παραλίας θαλασσῶν*, Ashter continued on the sea shore, *Levit. 8. 35.* : *וַיָּשֶׁבֶת אֶת־הַיּוֹם וְלֵילָה שְׁבַע יָמִים* : *καὶ ἐμνήσθη τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς μαρτυρίας καὶ ἐμνήσθη ἐπὶ αὐτῇ ἡμέρας, ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς, ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας.* Therefore shall ye abide at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, day and night, seven dayes. Upon wh ch plac: S. Augustine, Quid est quod dicit Moyses ad Aaron & filios ejus cum sanctificantur ad ineundum sacerdotium? *Ad testimonium tabernaculi testimonii sedebitis septem dies, die & nocte, ne moriamini.* Numquid nam credibile est situ corporis uno loco sedere præceptos per dies septem die & nocte, unde se omnino non commoverent? Nec tamen hic tanquam allegorice aliquid significatum, quod non fieret, cogendi sumus accipere, sed potius agnoscere locutionem Scripturarum, ubi Sessionem pro habitatione & commoratione posuit. Non enim quia dictum est de Semel quod *sederet in Hierusalem annos tres*, interpretandum est per totum illud tempus in sella sedisse & non surrexisse. Hinc & sedes dicuntur, ubi habent commorationem quorum sedes sunt; habitatio quippe hoc nomen accepit, *Quæst. super Levit. 24.*

* *Sedet ad dextram Patris.* Credite, Sedere intelligite habitare; quomodo dicimus de quocunq; homine, in ista patria sedit per tres annos. Dicit illud & Scriptura sedisse quendam in civitate tantum tempus. Numquid sedit, & nunquam surrexit? Ideo hominum habitationes sedes dicuntur. Ubi habitantur sedes, numquid semper sedetur, non surgitur, non ambulatur? Et tamen sedes vocantur. Sic ergo credite habitare Christum in dextera Dei Patris ubi est, *Author lib. de Symb. ad Galat. b.*

Again, the Notion of *sitting* implieeth rest, quietnesse and indisturbance; according to that promise in the Prophet, *They shall sit every man under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid.* So Christ is ascended into heaven, where resting from all paines and sorrows, he is seated, free from all disturbance and opposition; God having placed him at his right hand, untill he hath made his enemies his footstool.

Micah 4. 4.

B b b b

Third-

† Ipsum ver-
bum *sedere*
regni significat
potestatem,
S. Hiero. *Com.*
ad Eph. 6. 1.
v. 19.
Heb. 12. 2.
Psal. 110. 1.
1 Cor. 15. 25.

Thirdly, this *sitting* implyeth yet more then quietnesse or continuance, even † dominion, soveraignty, and Majesty; as when *Solomon* sate in the throne of his Father, he raigned over *Israel* after the death of his Father. And thus *Christ* is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. And *S. Paul* did well interpret those words of the Prophet, *Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footstool*, saying, *He must raigntill he hath put all enemies under his feet.*

Prov. 20. 8.
Isa. 16. 5.

Fourthly, this *sitting* doth yet more properly and particularly imply the right of Judicature, and so especially expresseth a King that sitteth in the throne of Judgement; as it is written, *In mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgement, and hastening righteousnesse.*

* *Sedere* quod
dicitur Deus,
non membro-
rum positione
sed judicariam
significat pote-
statem, qua il-
la Majestas
nunquam ca-
ret, semper

And so *Christ* * sitting at the right hand of God is manifested and declared to be the great Judge of the quick and the dead. Thus to *sit* doth not signifie any peculiar inclination or flexion, any determinate location or position of the body, but to be in heaven with permanence of habitation, happinesse of condition, regall and judiciary power; as in other * Authors such significations are usuall.

digna dignis tribuendo; quamvis in extremo judicio multo manifestius inter homines Unigeniti Dei Filii Judicis vivorum & mortuorum claritas indubitata effulgebit, S. Aug. *de Fide & Symb.* c. 7. Hoc quod dicitur Filius sedere ad dextram Patris, demonstratur quod ipse homo, quem suscepit Christus, potestatem acceperit Judicantis, *Author.* l. 3. *de Symb. ad Catechum.* † Most anciently *sedere* did signifie no more then esse, to be in any place; as *Servius* noteth on that place of *Virgil* *Æneid.* 9. *Luco tum forte parentis Philumni Turnus sacra trabea sedebat.* Sedebat, ut *Asper* dicit, erat. Quæ clausula antiqua est, & de usu remota. And then he goes on to shew that *sedere* is taken for that which men are wont to do sitting. Secundum *Plautum* autem *sedere* est consilium capere, qui inducit in *Mostellaria* servum dicentem, *Sine josta aram sedeam & dabo meliora consilia.* Sei secundum *Augures* *Sedere* est augurium captare: Namque post descendit latenter, inducens Picum solum sedentem, ut, *Parvaque sedebat Succinea trabea*, quod est augurium, cum alios stantes induxerit. Ergo *Sedebat*, aut erat, aut consilia capiebat, aut augurabatur.

The importance of the language being thus far improved, at last we find the substance of the Doctrine, which is, that sitting at the right hand of God was our Mediators solemn entry upon his Regall Office, as to the execution of that full Dominion which was due unto him. For *Rev. 5. 12.*
thy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom, and strength and honour and glory and blessing. Wherefore Christ after his death and resurrection saith, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.* *Mar. 28. 18.*
 For because he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Crosse, Therefore God hath *Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10*
highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And this obedience and submission was and is due unto him, because God raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not onely in this world but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.

There was an expresse promise made by God to David, *Thine house and thy Kingdome shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever.* *2 Sam. 7. 16.*
 This promise strictly and literally taken was but conditional: and the condition of the promise is elsewhere expressed, *Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne.* *Psal. 132. 12.*
If thy children will keep my Covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children also shall sit upon thy throne for evermore. Notwithstanding this promise the Kingdome of David was intercepted, nor was his family continued in the throne: part of the Kingdome was first went from his posterity, next the regality it self; and when it was restored, translated to another family: and yet we cannot say the promise was not made good, but onely cea-

fed in the obligation of a promise, because the condition was not perform'd. The posterity of *David* did not keep the covenant and testimony of their God, and therefore the throne of *David* was not by an uninterrupted lineall succession established to perpetuity.

LUC. I. 32, 33.

† Jer. 30. 9.

Ezech. 37. 24,

25. Hof. 3. 5.

Ezech. 34.

23, 24.

1 Sam. 16. 13.

2 Sam. 2. 4.

But yet in a larger and a better sense, after these intermissions, the throne of *David* was continued. When they had sinned and lost their right unto the crown, the kingdom was to be given unto him who never sinned, and consequently could never lose it, and he being of the seed of *David*, in him the throne of *David* was without interception or succession continued. Of him did the Angel *Gabriel* speak at his conception, *The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.* Thus the throne of *Christ* is called the throne of *David*, because it was promised unto *David*, and because the kingdom of *David* was a type, resemblance and representation of it; insomuch that *Christ* himself in respect of this kingdom is often called *David*, as particularly in that promise, *I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a Prince among them.*

Now as *David* was not onely first designed but also anointed King over *Israel*, and yet had no possession of the Crown; Seven yeares he continued anointed by *Samuel*, and had no share in the dominion; seven yeares after he continued anointed in *Hebron* onely King over the tribe of *Judah*; at last he was received by all the Tribes, and so obtained full and absolute regall power over all *Israel*, and seated himself in the royall city of *Jerusalem*; So *Christ* was born King of the *Jews*, and the conjunction of his humane nature with his divine in the union of his person was a sufficient unction to his Regall Office, yet as the

the Son of man he exercised no such dominion, professing that his *Kingdome was not of this world*; but after he rose from the dead, then as it were in *Hebron* with his own Tribe he tells the Apostles, *All power is given unto him*, and by virtue thereof, gives them injunctions; and at his ascension he enters into the *Jerusalem above*, and there sits down at the right hand of the throne of God, and so makes a solemn entry upon the full and entire dominion over all things; Then could S. Peter say, *Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ.*

Act. 2. 36.

The immediate effect of this Regall power, the proper execution of this Office, is the subduing of all his enemies; For he is *set down on the right hand of God, from hence forth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool*. This was the ancient custome of the Orientall conquerors, to tread upon the necks of their subdued enemies; as when *Josuah* had the five Kings as his prisoners, he said unto the men of war which went with him, *Come neer, put your feet upon the necks of them*. Thus to signifie the absolute and totall conquest of Christ, and the dreadfull Majesty of his throne, all his enemies are supposed to lye down before him, and he to set his feet upon them.

Heb. 10. 12, 13.

Jos. 10. 24.

The Enemies of Christ are of two kinds, either Temporall or Spirituall; The Temporall enemies I call such as visibly and actually oppose him, and his Apostles, and all those which professe to believe in his name. Such especially and principally were the *Jews*, who rejected, persecuted and crucified him; who after his Resurrection scourged, stoned, and despightfully used his disciples; who tryed all wayes and means imaginable to hinder the propagation, and dishonour the profession of Christianity. A part of his Regall Office was to subdue these enemies, and he set down on the right hand of God that they might be made his footstool: which they suddenly were according to his prediction, *There be some standing here which shall not*

Mar. 16. 28.

taft of death, till they fee the fon of man coming in his Kingdome. For within few yeares the Temple, the City, and the whole Polity of the *Jews* were destroyed for ever in a revenging manner by the hands of the *Romans* which they made ufe of to crucifie the Lord of life. The *Romans* themselves were the next enemies, who first complied with the *Jews* in Christs crucifixion, and after in defence of their heathen Deities endeavoured the extirpation of Christianity by successive persecutions. These were next to be made the footstool of the King of Kings, and so they were, when *Rome* the regnant City, the head of that vast Empire, was taken and sack'd; when the Christians were preserved and the Heathens perished; when the worship of all their Idols ceased, and the whole *Roman* Empire marched under the banner of Christianity. In the same manner all those persons and Nations whatsoever which openly oppose and persecute the name of Christ, are enemies unto this King, to be in due time subdued under him, and when he calleth, to be slain.

Rom. 8. 21.

Joh. 12. 13.
Eph. 2. 2, 6, 12.

Rom. 5. 14, 17.

The Spirituall Enemies of this King are of another nature; such as by an invisible way make opposition to Christs dominion, as Sin, Satan, Death. Every one of these hath a Kingdome of it's own, set up and opposed to the Kingdome of Christ. The Apostle hath taught us, that *sin hath reigned unto death*; and hath commanded us not to let it reign in our mortall bodies, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof. There is therefore a Dominion and Kingdome of Sin set up against the throne of the immaculate Lamb. Satan would have bin like the most high, and being cast down from heaven, hath erected his throne below; he is the Prince of this world: the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience is the Prince of the power of the air; and thus the rulers of the darknesse of this world oppose themselves to the true light of the world. Death also hath it's dominion, and, as the Apostle speaks, *reigned from Adam to Moses; even by one offence death*,
reigned

reigned by one, and so set up a ruling and a regall power against *the Prince of life*.

Act. 3. 15.

For the destruction of these powers was Christ exalted to the right hand of God, and by his Regall office doth he subdue and destroy them all. And yet this destruction is not so universall, but that sin, Satan and Death shall still continue. 'Tis true he shall *put down all rule and all au-*

1 Cor. 15. 24.

thority and power, but this amounts not so much to a totall destruction, as to an absolute subjection: for as he is *able*, so will he *subdue all things unto himself*. The principall

Phil. 3. 21.

end of the Regall office of the Mediator is the effectuall redemption and actuall salvation of all those whom God hath given him, and whosoever or whatsoever opposeth the salvation of these is by that opposition constituted and become an Enemy of Christ. And because this Enmity is grounded upon that opposition, therefore so far as any thing opposeth the salvation of the sons of God, so far is it an Enemy, and no farther: And consequently, Christ by sitting at the right hand of God hath obtained full and absolute power utterly to destroy those three spirituall enemies so far as they make this opposition; and further then they doe oppose they are not destroyed by him, but subdued to him: whatsoever hindreth and obstructeth the bringing of his own into his kingdome, for the demonstration of Gods mercy is abolished; but whatsoever may be yet subservient to the demonstration of his justice is continued.

Christ then as King destroyeth the power of sin in all those which belong unto his Kingdome, annihilating the guilt thereof by the virtue of his death, destroying the dominion thereof by his actuall grace, and taking away the spot thereof by grace habituall. But in the reprobate and damned soules the spot of sin remaineth in its perfect die, the dominion of sin continueth in it's absolute power, the guilt of sin abideth in a perpetuall obligation to eternall pains: but all this in subjection to his throne, the glory of which

con-

consisteth as well in punishing Rebellion as rewarding loyalty.

Heb. 2. 14.

Ephes. 6. 11.

2 Tim. 2. 26.

1 Joh 3. 8.

1 Timoth. 3. 6.

Again, Christ sitting on the right hand of God destroyeth all the strength of Satan and the powers of hell: by virtue of his death, perpetually represented to his Father, he *destroyeth him that had the power of Death, that is, the Devil*. But the actuall destruction of these powers of darkness hath reference onely to the Elect of God. In them he preventeth the *wiles*; those he taketh out of the *snare*; in them he destroyeth the *works*; those he preserveth from *the condemnation of the Devil*. He freeeth them here from the prevailing power of Satan by his grace, he freeeth them hereafter from all possibility of any internall opposition by his glory. But still the reprobate and damned soules are continued slaves unto the powers of hell; and he which sitteth upon the throne delivereth them to the Devil and his Angells, to be tormented with and by them for ever; and this power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the divine justice.

1 Cor. 15. 26.

Hos. 13. 14.

1 Cor. 15. 54.

Thirdly, Christ sitting on the throne of God at last destroyeth death it self: *For the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death*. But this destruction reacheth no further then removing of all power to hinder the bringing of all such persons as are redeemed actually by Christ into the full possession of his heavenly kingdome. He *will ransom them from the power of the grave*, he *will redeem them from death*. O death, he *will be thy plagues*; O grave, he *will be thy destruction*. The trump shall sound, the graves shall open, the dead shall live, the bodies shall be fram'd again out of the dust, and the soules which left them shall be reunited to them, and all the sons of men shall return to life, and *death shall be swallowed up in victory*. The sons of God shall then be made compleatly happy both in soul and body, never again to be separated, but to inherit eternall life. Thus he who sitteth at the right hand of God *hath abolished death, and*

and brought life and immortality to light. But to the Reprobate & damned persons death is not destroyed but improved. They rise again indeed to life, and so the first death is evacuated, but that life to which they rise is a second, and a far worse death. And thus Christ is set down at the right hand of God that he might subdue all things to himself.

The Regall power of Christ, as a branch of the Mediatorship, is to continue till all those Enemies be subdued. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. But now we see not yet all things put under him. Therefore he must still continue there; and this necessity is grounded upon the promise of the Father, and the expectation of the Son. Sit thou on my right hand, untill I make thine enemies thy footstool, saith the Father; upon which words we may ground as well the continuation as the session. Upon this promise of the Father the Son sate down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. Being then the promise of God cannot be evacuated, being the expectation of Christ cannot be frustrated, it followeth that our Mediator shall exercise the Regall power at the right hand of God till all opposition shall be subdued.

1 Cor. 15. 25.

Heb. 2. 8.

Psal. 110. 1.

Heb. 10. 12, 13.

When all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into his Kingdome, when those which refused him to rule over them, shall be slain, that is, when the whole office of the Mediator shall be completed and fulfill'd, then every branch of the execution shall cease. As therefore there shall no longer continue any act of the Propheticall part to instruct us, nor any act of the Priestly part to intercede for us, so there shall be no further act of this Regall power of the Mediator necessary to defend and preserve us. The beatificall vision shall succeed our information and instruction, a present fruition will prevent oblation and intercession, and perfect security will need no actuall defence and protection,

C c c c

section,

Gal. 3. 20.

1 Cor. 15. 24.
28.

Videamus an
traditio regni
defectio sit in-
telligenda reg-
nandi, ut quod
tradidit Filius
Patri tradendo
non teneat,
S. Hilar. l. 11.

2 Tim. 2. 12.

Rev. 11. 15.

† Οὐ τὸ βασι-
λειαν ἐκ τῆς
ἐκκλησίας. We
find not these
words in the
Nicene Creed,
as it was in it
self before the
addition at
Constantino-
ple But no. long
after, S. Cy-
ril expounds them in his Catechism, and Epiphanius in Ancorata repeating two

cession. As therefore the generall notion of a Mediator
ceaseth when all are made one, because a Mediator is not a
Mediator of one; so every part or branch of that Media-
torship, as such, must also cease, because that unity is in all
parts compleat. Then cometh the end, when he shall have
delivered up the Kingdome to God, even the Father, when
he shall have put down all rule and all authority and pow-
er. For when all things shall be subdued unto him, then
shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that hath put
all things under him, that God may be all in all.

Now though the Mediatorship of Christ be then re-
signed, because the end thereof will then be performed;
though the Regall Office as part of that Mediatorship be
also resigned with the whole; yet we must not think that
Christ shall cease to be a King, or loose any of the power
and honour which before he had. The dominion which he
hath was given him as a reward for what he suffered: and
certainly the reward shall not cease when the work is done.
He hath promised to make us Kings and Priests, which
honour we expect in heaven, believing we shall reign with
him for ever, and therefore for ever must believe him King.
The kingdomes of this world are become the kingdomes of
the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and e-
ver, not onely to the modiflicated eterniety of his Mediator-
ship, so long as there shall be need of Regall power to sub-
due the enemies of Gods elect; but also to the complete e-
ternity of the duration of his humanity, which for the future
is coeternall to his Divinity.

Least we should imagine that Christ should ever cease to
be King, or so interpret this Article, as if he were after the day
of judgement to be removed from the right hand of God,
the Ancient Fathers added those words to the Nicene Creed,
† whose kingdome shall have none end, against the Heresie
which then arose denying the eterniety of the Kingdome of
Christ.

The

words, a shorter and a longer, §. 120, and 121. both these words in both.
 After this they were added expressly in the Constantinopolitan Creed. And the reason
 of their insertion without question was that which S. Cyril insinuateth in his explica-
 tion, that is, the Heresie which was then newly begun. Καὶ ποτέ πνθ' ἀκούσας λέ-
 γοντες, ὅτι τέλει ἔχει ἡ Χριστοῦ βασιλεία, μίσησιν πλὴν ἀρεσιν, τῷ δράκοντις
 ἐστὶν ἡ καρδία προσφάτως· ὅτι πλὴν Γολγοθῆς ἀναρυσθεῖσα ἐτόλμησεν ληγεῖν,
 ἐπὶ μὲν τὸ τέλος τῷ κόσμῳ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβασιλεύει· καὶ ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Λό-
 γος ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐξῆλθεν, ὡς καὶ οἱ Πατέρες πάλιν ἀναλυθεῖς ἐκτίεισι, Catech. 15.
 This was the particular Heresie of Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra, followed by Photinus
 therein the same place, and therefore termed by S. Cyril ὅτι πλὴν Γολγοθῆς ἀναρυσ-
 θείσα. It consisted of two parts; first, that the Kingdom of Christ did wholly cease at the
 end of this world; secondly, that the Word was resolved again into the Father, and
 consequently did not onely cease to reign, but also cease to exist. Which is yet more plain-
 ly expressed by Eusebius in his second book against Marcellus, Καὶ πάλιν τὸν ἀ-
 φημι πάλιν εἰρηάζει μετὰ τὸν τῆς κρίσεως καιρὸν, τῷ ᾧ Λόγος ἐντομὴν πρὸ Θεοῦ, ὡς
 πάλιν ἕτερον εἶναι πλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τῆς δὲ σαρκὸς ἐξήμην καταλελειμένης καὶ τοῦ
 Λόγου ὡς μὴτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ποτε ὑφείσθαι, μὴτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὃν
 ἀνέλεψε. This Heresie of Marcellus S. Basil properly calls an impiety εἰς τὴν ἀνο-
 μίαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν· Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Epist. 78. and again Epist. 52. οἱς αὐτὴν τὴν
 ἡμετέραν τῆς τοῦ μονοφυσίτου δοκίμης· which he there more fully expresseth, "Ὅς
 (Μάρκελλον) Λόγον ἡ ἐρήνην τὸν Μονοφυσίτην δίδωσι, καὶ χρεῖαν καὶ ὅτι καὶ πρὸς
 ἡμᾶς, πάλιν δὲ οἱ τὸν ὅτι ἐξῆλθε ἐπὶ πνεύματι, ὡς καὶ πρὸς τῆς ἐξόδου εἶναι,
 ἐπὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐπιόδου ὑφείσθαι. This existence of the Word and the Kingdom of the
 Son that Heresie made coeternall; beginning when the Word came from the Father, that is,
 at the Incarnation, and ending when the Word returned into the Father, that is, at the
 day of judgement. Which is manifestly delivered by the Eastern Bishops in that Pro-
 fession of Faith which they sent to those in Italy, "Ἀλλ' ἐκ τότε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν γενο-
 μένῳ καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξ ἑτῆς ἡμετέρας ἐκ τῆς παρ' ἐνὶ Σάρκι ἀνέλεψε, πρὸ τε-
 τραπεσίων ὅλων ἐστίν." Ἐκ τότε γὰρ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀρχὴν βασιλείας ἐξηκίνα δόξασι,
 καὶ τῷ ἐξ ἑτῆς αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν Σωτηρίαν καὶ κρίσιν. Τοιοῦτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρ-
 κελίου καὶ Φωτίνου καὶ Ἀσχερογρητῆρος, οἱ τὴν περὶ αἰώνιον ὑπαρξίν τε καὶ δοκίμην
 τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀτρεχέτητον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν ἀθετοῦσιν, ἱσχυόμενοι τὴν μον-
 οφυσίαν, Socrat. l. 2. c. 19. But although Marcellus did thus teach the Kingdom
 of Christ not to be eternall, yet his Heresie did not so much consist in the denyall of this
 eternality, as of the subsistence and person of our Saviour: for otherwise he did truly teach
 that Christ was an eternall King; As appeareth out of his own words in his book a-
 gainst Asterius the Arian, cited by Eusebius, Οὐκοῦν ὅσον τινα δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἡ καὶ
 ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ οἰκονομία τε καὶ βασιλεία, ὅθεν γὰρ ἕτερον βύλεται ἢ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ
 καὶ Ἀποστόλου ρηθὲν, ὡς αὐτῷ τῷ ἐχθρῷ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον ἦν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ·
 ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν καὶ ὑποπόδιον ἦν ποδῶν, ἐκ ἧτις καὶ τῆς ἐν μέλει
 τῆς βασιλείας πάντων καὶ ὅλης βασιλεὺς ὑπάρχων. And therefore he made the
 same confession with the Catholics when he delivered an account of his Faith to Julius
 Bishop of Rome, Πιστεύω δὲ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ καὶ ὅτι Θεός, καὶ ὁ
 τοῦ μονοφυσίτου υἱὸς Λόγος ὁ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων πρὸ Πατρὸς, καὶ μηδεπώποτε ἀ-
 χλῦν

τῷ ἱερῷ, ἰσχυρῶς, ὁμολογῶς ἐκ τῆς Θεῆς ὑποδράχων, ἡ κλιθεὶς, ἡ ποιηθεὶς, ὁμῶς ἀντι-
 ἀντὶ συμβασιλεύων τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, ἡ τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ τὴν τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ
 ὑποταγάν, ἡ ἐστὶν τῇ Θεῷ, Epiph. Hæc / . 72. §. 2.

The profession of faith in Christ as sitting on the right hand of God is necessary; First, to mind us of our duty, which must needs consist in subjection and obedience. The Majesty of a King claimeth the loyalty of a Subject; and if we acknowledge his authority, we must submit unto his power. Nor can there be a greater incitation to obedience, then the consideration of the nature of his government. Subject we must be whether we will or no; but if willingly, then is our service perfect freedom; if unwillingly, then is our averseness everlasting misery. † Enemies we all have bin, under his feet we all shall be, either adopted or subdued. A double Kingdome there is of Christ; one of Power, in which all are under him; another of Propriety, in those which belong unto him: none of us can be excepted from the first, and happy are we if by our obedience we shew our selves to have an interest in the second; for then that Kingdome is not onely Christ's but ours.

† Inimicus erat, eris sub pedibus ejus aut adoptatus aut vinctus, S. August.

* Βασιλείας ἴσθαι δύο οἷον ἡ γρηγορή, τὴν μὲν κατ' οἰκείωσιν, τὴν δὲ καὶ δημιουργίαν βασιλεύειν μὲν ὅσα πάντων καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ἰουδαίων καὶ δαιμόνων καὶ ἀντιπαταγμένων καὶ τὸν τῆς δημιουργίας λόγον βασιλεύειν δὲ ὅσα πρὸς πεισῶν καὶ ἐκόντων καὶ ὑποταγμένων κατὰ τὸν τῆς οἰκείωσης, S. Chrysost. Hom. 39. in 1. ad Corinth.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe in Christ sitting on the right hand of God, that we might be assured of an auspicious protection under his gracious dominion. For God by this exaltation hath given our Saviour to be the head over all things to the Church; and therefore from him we may expect direction and preservation. There can be no illegality where Christ is the Law-giver: there can be no danger from hostility where the Son of God is the Defender. The very name of † head hath the signification not

Phil. 1. 22.

† This is the exclamation of S. Chrysostome upon those words of S. Paul, Βαβαί τῷ πατρί καὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀνήγαγον; ὡς περ διὰ τινος ἔλκων μηχανῆς, εἰς ὑψίστην ἀνέγαγε μίαν καὶ αὐτὴν ὁμολογήσαντες εἰς ἐκεῖνον τὸν δρόμον. ἐνθα ὁ καραλὴ ἐκείνῳ καὶ τῷ

only

dyed, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. For he which was accepted in his oblation, and therefore sat down on Gods right hand, to improve this acceptation continues his intercession; and having obtained all power by virtue of his humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixtion; by an humble omnipotency, or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence, and presenting his † postulations at the throne of God.

† S. Austin
ai/cow sing ut-
on that place of
 S. Paul, 1 Tim.

2. 1. I exhort that first of all supplications, prayers and intercessions be made for all men, observeth what is the nature of Intercession. Pro interpellationibus autem quod nostri, secundum codices credo vestros postulationes posuisti. Hic interim duo, id est, quod alii postulationes, alii interpellationes interpretati sunt, unum verbum transse re voluerunt, quod Græcus habet ἐντεύχεσθαι. Et profecto advertit: Sed nostra aliud esse interpellare, aliud postulare. Non enim solemus dicere, postulant interpellaturi, sed interpellant postulaturi. Veruntamen ex vicinitate verbum usurpatum, cui propinquitas ipsa impetrat intellectum, non est velut censoria notatione culpandum. Nam & de ipso Domino Iesu Christo dictum est quod interpellat pro nobis. Numquid interpellat, & non etiam postulat? Imo vero quia postulat pro eo positum est interpellat. Evidenter quippe alibi de eo dicitur, Si quis peccaverit, Advocatum habemus ad Patrem, Iesum Christum justum, ipse est exoratio pro peccatis nostris. Quanquam fortassis codices apud vos etiam in eo loco de Domino Iesu Christo non habent interpellat pro nobis, sed postulat pro nobis. In Græco enim, quo verbo hic positæ sunt interpellationes, quas ipse posuisti postulationes, ipsum & illic verbum est, ubi scriptum est, interpellat pro nobis. Cum igitur & qui precatur orat, & qui orat precatur & qui interpellat Deum ad hoc interpellat ut orat & precatur, &c. Epist. 59. ad Paulinum, Quæst. 5.

Having thus explicated the Session of our Saviour, we are next to consider the Description of him at whose right hand he is set down; which seems to be delivered in the same terms, with which the Creed did first begin *I believe in God the Father Almighty*: and indeed, as to the expression of his essence, it is the same name of God; as to the setting forth his Relation, it is the same name of Father; but as to the adjoyning attribute, though it be the same word, it is not the same notion of *Almighty*. What therefore we have spoken of the nature of God, and the Person

Luc. i. 34.

the testimony of an Angel, *For with God nothing shall be impossible*; secondly by the testimony of Christ himself, who said, *With men it is impossible, but not with God; for with God all things are possible*. Now he, to whom all things are possible, and to whom nothing is impossible, is truly and properly Omnipotent. Thus whatsoever doth not in it self imply a repugnancy of being or subsisting, hath in reference to the power of God a possibility of production: and whatsoever in respect of the power of God hath an impossibility of production, must involve in it self a repugnancy or contradiction.

Mar. 10. 27.

This truth, though confessed by the heathens, hath yet bin denied by some of them; but with such poor and insufficient Arguments, that we shall need no more than an explication of the doctrine to refute their objections.

† The Arguments which the Heathen used are briefly

touch'd by Plutarch, but were more largely delivered by Pliny. Ἀνθρώπου δὲ (φύσιν) ὥς κε κομιμάχῳ τῶν ἀέρων, εἰ θεὸν οἶδεν, ἴδ' ὅτι καὶ ῥήξαι δαίμονι καὶ δυνάμει. (so it must be read) ἔδδ' ὅτι θεὸς δυνάμει καὶ ποιεῖν. Ἐπεὶ τοιγαυθὶ θεὸς ἔστι, ποιεῖ τὴν χόνα μέλαιναν, ἴδ' ὅτι πῦρ ψυχρὸν, τὸ δὲ καὶ ὕδωρ ἐρρῶδον, καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον, Plutarch. *De Plac.* lib. 1. c. 7. Imperfecta vero in homine naturæ præcipua solaria ne Deum quidem posse omnia. Namque nec sibi potest mortem confiscare, si velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vitæ precibus, nec mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos, nec facere ut qui vixit non vixerit, qui honores gessit non gesserit; nullumque habere in præterita jus præterquam oblivionis: atque (ut facietis quoque argumentis societas hæc cum Deo copuletur) ut bis dena viginti non sint, ac multa similiter efficere non posse: per quæ declaratur haud dubie naturæ potentia, idque esse quod Deum vocamus, Plin. *Nat. Hist.* l. 2. c. 7. *Add unto these that Ouj elion of Elymas the sorcerer, recorded by Dionysius, καίτοι φησὶν Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος, εἰ πωτὸ δυνάμει ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς πῶς λέγεται π μὴ δυνάμει πρὸς τὸ κατ' ὑμᾶς θεολόγη. Λοιδόρει*) ὅτι τῶν θεῶν Παῦλος φήσεται, μὴ δυνάμει τὸν θεὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀνέστησαι, *De Divinis Nominibus, cap. 8.*

First then we must say God is Omnipotent, because all power whatsoever is in any Creature is derived from him; and well may he be term'd *Almighty*, who is the fountain of all might. There is no activity in any Agent, no influence of any Cause, but what dependeth and proceedeth from

from the Principall Agent, or the first of Causes. † There is nothing in the whole circumference of the Universe, but hath some kind of activity, and consequently some power to act; (for nothing can be done without a power to doe it:) and as all their entities flow from the first of beings, so all their severall and various powers flow from the first of powers: and as all their beings cannot be conceived to depend of any but an infinite essence, so all those powers cannot proceed from any but an infinite power.

Secondly, God may be called Omnipotent, * because there can be no resistance made to his power, no opposition to his will, no rescue from his hands. *a The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannull it? his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back? b He doeth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what dost thou?* According to the degrees of power in the Agent and the Resistant is an action perform'd or hindered; if there be more degrees of power in the Resistant then the Agent, the action is prevented; if fewer, it may be retarded or debilitated, but not wholly hinder'd or suppress'd. But if there be no degree of power in the Resistant in reference to the Agent, then is the action totally vigorous; and if in all the powers beside that of God there be not the least degree of any resistance, we must acknowledge that power of his above all opposition, to be infinite. As *Jehosaphat* said, *In thine hand O God, is there power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?* From hence there is no difficulty with God to perform any thing; no greater endeavour or activity to produce the greatest then the least of creatures; but an equall facility in reference unto all things; which cannot be † imagined but by an infinite excellē of power above all resistance.

† Ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ
δυνάμει τοῦ
Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ
ἐκείνου πάντα τὰ
ὄντα γινώσκουσιν, καὶ
ἐκείνου ὅτι τὸ
ὄντων ὁ παρτε-
λὼς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ
ἵδ' ἐχον τινα
δυνάμειν, ὅτι
ἡ νοεῖν, ἡ
λογικὴν, ἡ αἰ-
σθητικὴν ἡ ζω-
τικὴν ἡ ἐσιώ-
γη δυνάμειν ἔ-
χει καὶ αὐτὸ
ἵδ', ἐκείνου
ἐκείνου, τὸ ἵδ'
δύναμειν, ἐκείνου
ἵδ' ἐκείνου
τὸ ἀπορροῖς
δυνάμειν,
Dionys. Arcop.
De Divin. Nom.
cap. 8.

* Neque enim
veraciter ob a-
liud vocatur
Omnipotens,
nisi quia quic-
quid vult po-
test; nec volun-
tate cujuspiam
creaturæ vo-
luntatis omni-
potentis impe-
ditur effectus,
S. Aug. Ench.
ad Laur. c. 96.

a Isa. 14. 27.
b Dan. 4. 35.

c Chron. 20. 6.

† Nisi omnipotens esset, non una eademque facilitate
summa atque ima fecisset, Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, cap. 3.

D d d d Thirdly,

† Quis est
omnipotens
nisi qui omnia
potest? S. Aug.
de Trin. l. 4.
6. 7.

Thirdly, God is yet more properly called Omnipotent, because his own active power extendeth it self to † all things; neither is there any thing imaginably possible which he cannot doe. For it must be infinite activity which answereth to all possibility. Thus the power of God is infinite extensively in respect of it's object, which is all things; for whatsoever effects there be of his power yet still there can be more produced; intensively in respect of the action, or perfection of the effect produced, for whatsoever addition of perfection is possible is within the sphere of Gods omnipotency. The object then of the power of God is whatsoever is simply and absolutely possible, whatsoever is in it self such as that it may be; and so possible every thing is which doth not imply a contradiction. Again, whatsoever implyeth a contradiction is impossible, and therefore is not within the object of the power of God, because impossibility is the contradiction of all power. For that is said to imply a contradiction, which if it were, it would necessarily follow that the same thing would be and not be. But it is impossible for the same thing both to be and not to be at the same time and in the same respect: and therefore whatsoever implyeth a contradiction is impossible. From whence it followeth, that it may be truly said, God cannot effect that which involveth a contradiction, but with no derogation from his power: and it may be as truly said, God can effect whatsoever involveth not a contradiction, which is the expression of an infinite power.

Now an Action may imply a contradiction two wayes, either in respect of the Object, or in respect of the Agent. In respect of the object it may imply a contradiction Immediately or Consequentially. That doth imply a contradiction immediately, which plainly and in termes doth signifie a repugnancy and so destroyes it self, as for the same thing to be and not to be, to have bin and not to have bin. And therefore it must be acknowledged that it is not

the power of God † to make that not to have bin, which hath already bin : but that is no derogation to Gods power, because not within the object of any power. And he may certainly have all power, who hath not that which belongeth to no power. Again, that doth imply a contradiction consequentially, which in apparance seemeth not to be impossible, but by necessary consequence if admitted, leadeth intallibly to a contradiction. As that one body should be at the same time in two distinct places, speaks no repugnancy in terms; but yet by consequence it leads to that which is repugnant in it self; which is that the same body is but one body, and not but one. Being then a covert and consequentiall contradiction is as much & as truly a contradiction as that which is open and immediate, it followeth, that it is as impossible to be effected, and therefore comes not under the power of God.

to ipso quo vera sunt falsa sint, S. Aug. contra Faustum l. 26 c. 5. It is granted here-
[re to be true, which Pliny objects, Deum non facere ut qui vixit non vixerit, qui ho-
norem gessit, non gesserit; ut this prove, not ng against omnipotency because it is no
all of impossibility. Had the act objected infeasible, and God had not the power to effect it,
then had he wanted some power, & consequently had not bin Omnipotent. But being it is
not want of power in the Agent, but of possibility in the Object, it proveth no deficiency
in God.

That doth imply a Contradiction in respect of the Agent, which is repugnant to his essentiall perfection; for in every action floweth from the essence of the Agent, whatsoever is totally repugnant to that essence, must involve a contradiction as to that Agent. Thus we may say God cannot sleep, God cannot want, God cannot † dye;

sancta præscire, sicut nec potestas ejus minuitur, cum dicitur mori falliq; non posse. licenim hoc nõ potest, ut potius si posset, minoris esset utiq; potestatis. Recte qui p-
Omnipotens dicitur qui tamẽ mori & falli non potest Dicitur enim. Non potens
faciendo quod vult non patiendo quod non vult. Quod si ei accidit nequaquam
est Omnipotens Unde propterea quidam non potest quia Omni, otens est, . Aug.
de Civ. Dei, l. 5. c. 10 Nam ego dico quanta nõ possit Non potest mori, nõ potest pec-
care, non potest menti i, nõ potest falli. Tanta nõ potest, quæ si posset non esset Om-
nipotens, Autor Serm. 119. de Temp.

† Τὸ γεννᾶν ἐκ
ἐνδὲ ἑαυτοῦ μὴ
γεννᾶν, διὸ ὁ
θεὸς Ἀγεννητός.
Μόνος ὃς αὐτὸς
καὶ ὁὗτος στεί-
κεται Ἀγεννητός
πολλὴν ἑαυτοῦ
ἢ πατέρα γ-
μῖνα, Αἰ. 1. Et
ibid. Eudem. l. 5.
c. 2. Quisquis
dicit, Si omni-
potens est Deus,
faciat ut quæ fa-
cta sūt facta nõ
fuerint, non vi-
det hoc se dice-
re, si omnipotens
est, faciat ut ea
quæ vera sunt

† Neq; enim &
vitā Dei & præ-
scientiā Dei sub
necessitate po-
nimus si dica-
mus, Necessè
est Deum sem-
per v vere &

and infinite sanctity. We who are ignorant may be deceived, we who are sinfull may deceive; but it is repugnant to that nature to be deceived which is no way subject unto ignorance; it is contradictory to that essence to deceive, which is no way capable of sin. For as it is a plain contradiction to know all things and to be ignorant of any thing: so is it to know all things and to be deceived; as it is an evident contradiction, to be infinitely holy, and to be sinfull, so is it to be infinitely holy and deceive. But it is impossible for any one to lye, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Therefore it is a manifest contradiction to say that God can lye, and consequently it is no derogation from his Omnipotency, that he cannot. Whatsoever then God cannot doe, whatsoever is impossible to him, doth not any way prove that he is not Almighty, but onely shew that the rest of his Attributes and perfections are as essentiall to him as his power: and as his power suffereth no resistance, so the rest of his perfections admit no repugnance. Well therefore may we conclude him absolutely † Omnipotent, who by being able to effect all things consistent with his perfections sheweth infinite ability: and by not being able to doe any thing repugnant to the same perfections, demonstrateth himself subject to no infirmity or imbecillity. And in this manner we maintain Gods Omnipotency, with the * best and clearest, against the worst and the latest of the Heathen Authors.

Thus

ὅτι τὸ παντοδύναμον Θεῶν. Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ δυναθῆναι τι γίνεσθαι, ἀπέριε δύναμει καὶ ἀδυναμίας τεκμήριον. τὸ δὲ γε δυναθῆναι, ἀδυναμίας δὴ πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἀδυναμίας. Ὅτι τῶν ἑκαστοῦ ἴδιον ἐκείνου Θεοῦ κηρύττει καὶ ἀνελκίσκει. Dial. 3. And Crigen contr. celsum 1. 3. gives this for the Christians general rule, Δύναμις καὶ ἡμᾶς πάντα ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔχει, καὶ τῶ ἀγαθοῦ ἔχει, καὶ τῶ κακοῦ ἔχει καὶ ἔστιν. * It was the constant opinion of the most ancient Heathens, as appears by Homer, who expresseth it plainly, Odyss. κ'.

Χάριτον δὲ τ' ὀρύσσειν

Ἀνδράσιν ἐπὶ δυνάμει, θεοὶ δὲ τὴν πάντα δύνανται.

And the same sense is attributed to Linus in a Distich cited for his by Stobæus; but

D d d d 3

may

tent as the Father is. But we have already shew'd that the Son of God is truly God, and shall hereafter shew that the Holy Ghost is also God; and that by the same nature by which the Father is God. The *Father* therefore is *Almighty*, because the Father is God; *the Son Almighty*, because the Son is God; and *the Holy Ghost Almighty*, because the Holy Ghost is God. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are God by the same Divinity: therefore the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are Omnipotent by the same Omnipotency. The Father then is not called *Almighty* by way of exclusion, but is here mentioned with that attribute peculiarly, † because the power of God answereth particularly to the right hand of God, as being *the right hand of power*. The *Father* therefore is here described by the notion of *Almighty*, to shew that Christ, having ascended into heaven, and being set down at *the right hand of God*, is invested with a greater power then he exercis'd before: and that power which was then actually confer'd upon him, acknowledgeth no bounds or limits; but *all power* in the ultimate extent of it's infinity is *given unto* him, who is set down on the right hand of him who is *God the Father*; and being so is therefore truly and properly *Almighty*.

† Nor is it usual in other Authors to make use of the word Omnipotens, rather in relation to the present occasion, than in reference to the person who is said to be omnipotent; as is observed by Servius upon that

verse of Virgil, *Æn. id. 9.* Juppiter omnipotens audacibus annueceptis. Hoc epitheton interdum ad gloriam numinis ponitur interdum ad causam dicentis. Namque hoc loco dicendo *Omnipotens* ostendit eum etiam his qui per se minus valent præstare posse virtutem.

It is necessary to profess belief in God *Almighty*; First, because the acknowledgement of his Omnipotency begetteth that fear, reverence, and submission which is due unto his infinite Majesty. *I will forewarn you*, saith our Saviour, *whom ye shall fear: Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell, yea, I say unto you, fear him.* Three times we are commanded to fear, and one onely reason rendred, but sufficient for a thousand fears,

LUC. 12. 5.

Gen 17. 1.

1 Pet. 5. 6.

fears; the power of him who is able eternally to punish us. God gave a generall command to *Abraham*, and with it a powerfull perswasion to obedience, when he said unto him, *I am the Almighty God. walk before me and be thou perfect.* It was a rationall advice which the Apostle giveth us, *Humble your selves under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time.*

† This was the Argument which the Pythagoreans used, who believed many mira-

culous actions, wh^{ch} others look'd upon as fabulous. Because they would disbelieve nothing which was referred to the divine power, and the reason of that was because they thought all thing possible to God, as we shewed before. Τὼν τοιούτων δ' (saith Jamblichus having related severall strange actions either fabulous or miraculous,) οὐδ' ὁμῶντων μυθικῶν ἀπομνημονεύουσιν ὡς μηδὲν ἀπισύντες, ὅτι ἀνεῖς το θεῶν ἀνάγιν. And whe eas others look'd upon them a weak and simple people, for giving credit to such fabulous relations, οὐδὲ πάντα τὰ τοιούτα ἐχὼν αὐτὲς εὐνδεῖς καὶ μὴ ἔχουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπισύντων, Jamblich. de Vita Pythag. cap. 28.

¶ Rom. 4. 20, 21.

† Nulla est in promissis Dei falsitas, quia nulla est in faciendis difficultas aut impossibilitas, Fulgent. l. 1. ad Monim.

Thirdly, it is not onely necessary in matters of bare faith, and notions of belief, but in respect of the active and operative reliance upon the promises of God. This was the particular confidence of *Abraham* the Father of the faithfull, who staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith giving glory to God, and being fully perswaded that what he had promised he was able also to perform. The promises of God are therefore true and sure, because he is both willing and able to perform them.

them. We doubt or distrust the promises of men, either because we may fear they intend not to doe what they have promised, or cannot doe what they intend; in the first we may suspect them, because they are subject to iniquity; in the second, because they are liable to infirmity. But being God is of infinite sanctity, he cannot intend by breaking his promises to deceive us, therefore if he be also of infinite power, he must be able to perform what he intended, and consequently we can have no reason to distrust his promises. From whence every good Christian may say with the Apostle, *I know whom I have believed, and I am perswaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.* ^{2 Tim. 1. 12.} I am assured that if I be a sheep and hear my Saviour's voice, the powers of darknesse and the gates of hell can never prevail against me: for it was the voice of the Son of God, *My Father which gave them me is greater then all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Fathers hand.* ^{Joh. 10. 29.}

Lastly, the belief of Gods omnipotency is necessary to give life to our devotions. We ask those things from heaven which none but God can give, and many of them such, as if God himself were not Almighty, he could not effect. And therefore in that form of Prayer which Christ hath taught us, we conclude all our petitions unto the Father with that acknowledgement, *For thine is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory.* ^{Mat. 6. 13.} Nor can there be a greater encouragement in the midst of all our temptations, then that we are invited to call upon him in the day of trouble, *who is able to doe exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.* ^{Eph. 3. 20.}

After this Explication of our Saviour's Session, we may conclude what every Christian ought, and may be suppos'd, to intend, when he maketh profession to believe that *Christ is set on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I assent

E e e c unto

unto this as a most infallible and necessary truth, that Jesus Christ ascending into the highest heavens, after all the troubles and sufferings endured here for our Redemption, did rest in everlasting happinesse; he which upon earth had not a place to lay his head, did take up a perpetuall habitation there, and sit down upon the throne of God, as a Judge, and as a King, according to his Office of Mediator, unto the end of the world, according to that which he merited by his Mediatorship, to all eternity; which hand of God the Father Almighty signifieth an omnipotent power, able to doe all things without any limitation, so they involve not a contradiction, either in themselves or in relation to his perfections. And thus I believe in Jesus Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE VII.

FROM † THENCE SHALL HE COME TO
JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

THIS Article containeth in it four Particular Considerations and no more; First, that Christ who is gone from us *shall come again*. Secondly, that the place from whence he shall then come is the highest heaven, to which he first ascended; for *from thence he shall come*. Thirdly, that the end for which he shall come, and the action which he shall perform when he cometh, is *to judge*; for *from thence he shall come to judge*. Fourthly, that the object of that Action, or the persons whom he shall judge are all men, whither dead before, or then alive; for *from thence shall he come to judge the quick and the dead*.

For the illustration of the first Particular two things will be necessary, and no more; first, to shew that the promised *Messias* was to come again after he once was come; secondly, to declare how our Jesus (whom we have already prov'd once to have come as the true *Messias*) did promise and assure us of a second coming.

That the *Messias* was to come again, was not onely certainly, but copiously foretold; the Scriptures did often assure us of a second advent. As often as we read of his griefs and humility; so often we were admonished of his coming to suffer: as often as we hear of his power and glory; so often we are assured of his coming to judge. We must not fancy, with the *Jews*, a double *Messias*, one the son of *Joseph*, the other of *David*; one of the tribe of *Ephraim*, the other of *Judah*; but we must take that for a certain truth, which they have made an occasion of their error; that the *Messias* is twice to come, once in all hu-

† Or, from whence; the Latines sometimes inde, sometimes unde. And the Greek is *θεν*, unde, both in the ancient MSS in Sir Robert Cottons Library, and in the Creed of Marcellus. But *ἐκθεν ἐρχόμενος*, in the latter MS. in Bennet Colledge Library. Others without inde or unde, onely venturus, as the Nicene Creed, *ἐκχούμενος χρίστος*, others *παλι ἐρχόμενος* or *ἔξοχα παλι*; and Fortunatus leaving out inde venturus, both onely *judicaturus vivos & mortuos*.

Jude. 14.

Dan. 7. 13, 14.

mility, to suffer and dye, as they conceive their son of Joseph; and again in all glory, to govern and judge, as they expect the son of David. Particularly, Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied of this Advent, saying, behold the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Angels. And more particularly Daniel saw the Representation of his judiciary power and glory. *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of dayes, and they brought him before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom: that all people, nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not passe away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.* This Son of man the † Jews themselves confesse to be the promised *Messias*, and they take the words to signifie his coming, and so far give testimony to the truth; but then they evacuate the prediction by a false interpretation, saying that * if the Jews went on in their sinnes, then the *Messias* should come in humility, according to the description in *Zachary*, * *lowly and riding upon an asse*; but if they pleased God, then he should come in glory, according to the description in the prophet *Daniel*, *with the clouds of heaven*. Whereas these

† R. Saadiah Gaon *ad locū*, וזהו משיח צדקנו ויבדכנו בנאמנו לאדני שב לימינו In Bereshit Rabba, speaking of the Genealogy concluding (1 Chron. 3. 24.) with Anani the youngest of the seven sonnes of Elioenai, the Author asks this question, וזה משיח שנ' חזה הויה בחווי, and who is this Anani? and answers it thus, חזה הויה וארו עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש אחזה חזה: This is the *Messias*, as it is written, Dan. 7. 13. *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man, came with Anani, that is the clouds of heaven*; Solomon Jarchi *ad locum*, אנש הוא מלך המשיח, and Aben Ezra *ibidem*, אמר דב שועה כי זה כבר אנש המשיח ונכון הדבר: So the Author of Tzeror Hammor, וסוד אדם הוא סוד המשיח כאומר כבר אנש אחי: The mystery of man is the mystery of the *Messias*, according to that of Daniel, he came as the Son of man. This place is mentioned for one of the כתובין which speak of the *Messiah*; in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 2. And the Midrash upon the 21. Psal. v. 7. אר בניה בשם ר' שמעון כתוב אחז אומ' עם ענני שמיא כבר אנש: speaking of the *Messias*. Indeed the Jews do so generally interpret this place of Daniel of the *Messias*, that they make it an Argument to prove that the *Messias* is not yet come, because no man hath yet come with the clouds of heaven. This Interpretation is delivered

אֲדָר אֶלְכַסְנֹדְרִי כְּתִיב עַל מֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ וְאָדָר עִנִּי
 שְׁמִיָּה כִּבְר אֱנוֹשׁ אַחֲרָה הֵיא וְכְתִיב עִנִּי וְיִרְכַּב עַל חֲמֹר וְכוּ עַם
 שְׁמִיָּה לֵא וְכוּ עִנִּי וְיִרְכַּב עַל חֲמֹר Idem etiam legitur in Bereshit Rabba
 I. Moshe Hadd. rshan, Gen. 49. 11. Thus they make the coming of Christ to depend
 upon their merit or demerit; whereas the promises of the Messiah are absolute and ir-
 revocable, depending only on the goodness of God, not to be evacuated or altered by
 the wickedness of man. Nay the unworthiness of the Jews which Christ found when he
 came in humility, is one speciall cause why he should come again i. g. ory.

these two descriptions are two severall predictions, & there-
 fore must be both fulfill'd. From whence it followeth, that,
 being Christ is already come *lowly and sitting upon an ass*,
 therefore hereafter he shall come gloriously *with the clouds*
of heaven. For if both those descriptions cannot belong to
 one and the same advent, as the Jews acknowledge, and
 both of them must be true because equally prophetically;
 then must there be a double advent of the same *Messias*,
 and so his second coming was foretold.

That our Jesus, whom we have already proved to have
 come once into the world as the true *Messias*, shall come
 the second time, we are most assured. We have the testi-
 mony of the Angels, *This same Jesus which is taken up*
from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye
have seen him goe into heaven. We have the promise of
 Christ himself to his Apostles, *If I goe to prepare a place*
for you, I will come again and receive you unto my self:
ye have heard how I said unto you, I goe away and come a-
gain unto you. He it is which from the beginning was to
 come: that expresse prophesie so represented him, *The Sce-*
per shall not depart from Judah untill Shiloh come; the
 name of *Shiloh* was obscure, but the notion of the *comer*,
 added to it, was most vulgar. According to this notion
 once Christ came, and being gone he keeps that notion still;
 he is to come again. *For yet a little while and he that shall*
come will come. Our Jesus then shall come, and not
 by that vulgar appellation *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, he which did once come into the world to
 make that notion good, is still to be known by the same appellation, and therefore
 will

AG. I. 11.

Joh. 14. 3, 28.

Gen. 49. 19.

Heb. 10. 37.

ὁ ἐρχόμενος
 ὁ ἐρχόμενος, that is, he
 who is known

will come again. This was it which made the Apostles ask that Question, *Matth. 24. 3. when shall these things be, and what shall be the signe of thy coming, and of the end of the world?*

Mat. 16. 28.

Revelat. 1. 7.

† R. Saadiah
Gaon upon
the place of
Daniel 7. 13.

עַם עֲנִי
הַשָּׁמַיִם הֵם
מַלְאְכֵי צִבְיָה
הַשָּׁמַיִם
הֵם הָיוּ

The clouds of heaven they are the Angels of the host of heaven; this is the great magnificence and power which God shall give unto the Messiah. *From hence is that exposition in Midrash Tillim, Psal. 21. 7. אֵל בְּרוּכָה בְּשֵׁם דְּשִׁמּוּאֵל כְּחוּב אַחַר אוֹם וְאִרְעָם עֲנִי שְׁמִי כְּבֹד אֱנִשׁ אַחֲרָהּ וְקִדְמוּתָהּ הַקְרִיבוּהוּ וְכָתִיב אַחֲרָהּ אֱמַר וְהַקְרִיבוּהוּ וְנִגַּשׁ אֵלַי הָאֵל* Rabbi Barachia said in the name of Rabbi Samuel, One Scripture saith (*Dan. 7. 13.*) And behold one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And another Scripture saith, (*Jerem. 30. 21.*) and I will cause him to draw near and he shall approach unto me. Behold in what manner? The Angels shall bring him into the midst of them.

only so, but shall so come, as the *Messias* was foretold, after the same manner, in the same glory of the Father, as the *Son of man* coming in his Kingdom. This was expressed in the propheticall vision by coming *with clouds*, and in the same manner shall our *Jesus* come; For *Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him*. Those clouds were anciently expounded by the † *Jews* of the glorious attendance of the Angels, waiting upon the *Son of man*: and in the same manner, with the same attendance doe we expect the coming of our *Jesus*, even as he himself hath taught us to expect him, saying, *a For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels*. And thus our *Jesus* as the true *Messias* shall come again,

The place from whence he shall come is next to be considered, and is sufficiently expressed in the Creed by reflection upon the place whither he went when he departed from us, For *he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, and from thence shall he come*: that is, from, and out of the highest heaven (where he now sitteth at the right hand of God) shall *Christ* hereafter come to judge the quick and the dead. For *him must the hea-*

ven,

we receive till the time of the restitution of all things; and Act. 3. 21.
 when that time is fulfill'd, from that heaven shall he
 come. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven 1 Thes. 4. 16.
 with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and with the
 trump of God. Our conversation ought to be in heaven, be-
 cause from thence we look for our Saviour the Lord Jesus.
 Our High-Priest is gone up into the Holy of holies not
 made with hands, there to make an atonement for us;
 therefore as the people of Israel stood without the Taber-
 nacle expecting the return of Aaron; so must we look un-
 to the heavens and expect Christ from thence; when the
 Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty 2 Thess. 1. 7.
 Angels. We do believe that Christ is set down on the
 right hand of God; but we must also look upon him as
 coming thence, as well as sitting there: and to that purpose
 Christ himself hath joyned them together, saying, Here-
 after shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of Mat. 26. 64.
 power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Thus shall
 the Saviour of the world come from the right hand of pow-
 er, in fulnesse of Majesty, from the highest heavens, as a
 demonstration of his sanctity: that by an undoubted au-
 thority, and unquestionable integrity, he might appear most
 fit to judge both the quick and the dead: which is the end
 of his second coming, and leads me to the third considera-
 tion, the act of his judging. From whence shall he come
 to judge.

For the explication of this Action, as it stands in this
 Article, three considerations will be necessary. First,
 how we may be assured that there is a Judgement to
 come, that any one shall come to judge. Secondly,
 in case we be assured that there shall be a Judgement, how
 appeareth that he which is ascended into heaven, that is,
 that Christ shall be the Judge. Thirdly, in case we can
 be assured that we shall be judged, and that Christ shall
 judge us, it will be worthy our enquiry in what this judge-
 ment shall consist, how this action shall be performed: and
 more

more then this cannot be necessary to make us understand, that *he shall come to judge.*

That there is a Judgement to come after this life, will appear demonstrable, whether we consider our selves who are to undergoe it, or God who is to execute it. If we doe but reflect upon the frame and temper of our own spirits, we cannot but collect and conclude from thence, that we are to give an account of our actions, and that a judgement hereafter is to passe upon us. There is in the soul of every man a Conscience, and wheresoever it is, it giveth testimony to this truth. The antecedent or directive conscience tells us what we are to doe, and the subsequent or reflexive conscience warns us what we are to receive. Looking back upon the actions we have done, it either approves or condemns them; and if it did no more, it would onely prove that there is a judgement in this life, and every man his own Judge. But being it doth not onely allow and approve our good actions; but also doth create a complacency, apology, and confidence in us; being it doth not onely disprove and condemn our evil actions, but doth also constantly accuse us, and breed a fearfull expectation and terrour in us; and all this prescinding from all relation to any thing either to be enjoyed or suffered in this life: it followeth, that this conscience is not so much a judge as a witnesse, bound over to give testimony, for or against us at some judgement after this life to passe upon us. For all men are *a Law unto themselves*, and have *the work of the law written in their hearts*, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.

Rom. 2. 15.

Again, if we consider the God who made us and hath full dominion over us, whither we look upon him in himself, or in his word, we cannot but expect a judgement from him. First, if we contemplate God in himself, we must acknowledge him to be the judge of all mankind, so

that

that a man shall say, verily he is a God that judgeth in the Psal. 58.11.

earth. Now the same God who is our Judge, is, by his attribute, necessary, and inseparable, Just; and this Justice is so essential to his Godhead, that we may as well deny him to be God, as to be Just. It was a rati-
onall expostulation which *Abraham* made, *shall not the* Gen. 18.25.

judge of all the earth do right? we may therefore infallibly conclude that God is a most just Judge; and if he be so, we may as infallibly conclude that after this life he will judge the world in righteousness. For as the affairs of this present world are ordered, though they lye under the disposition of providence, they shew no sign of an universal Justice. The wicked and disobedient persons are often so happy, as if they were rewarded for their impieties; the innocent and religious often so miserable, as if they were punished for their innocency. Nothing more certain then that in this life, rewards are not correspondent to the virtues, punishments not proportionable to the sinnes of men. Which consideration will inforce one of these conclusions; either that there is no judge of the Actions of mankind, or if there be a judge, he is not just, he renders no proportionable rewards or punishments; or lastly if there be a Judge, and that Judge be just, then is there a judgement in another world, and the effects thereof concern another life. Being then we must acknowledge that there is a Judge which judgeth the earth, being we cannot deny but God is that Judge, and all must confesse that God is most just; being the rewards and punishments of this life are no way answerable to so exact a justice as that which in dying must be; it followeth that there is a judgement to come, in which God will shew a perfect demonstration of his justice; and to which every man shall in his own bosome carry an undeniable witnesse of all his actions.

From hence the Heathen, having alwayes had a serious apprehension both of the power of the conscience of man,

F f f f

and

Act. 24. 27.

Act. 17. 31.

¶ This principle
of a Judgement
to come, Justin
Martyr pro-
pounds to the
Gentiles, as ge-

nerally acknowledged by all their writers, and as the great encouragement of his Apology for the Christian Religion. Ἐπεὶ τίς ἡμῶν ὁ περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας διασφάλειας περικλείεται λόγῳ; ἢς ἡ δόξα, οἰμαί, προσημύοντες τῆς ἀκινδυνότητος βίου πρὸς τοὺς νενομισμένους διὰ τὴν μέλει κατὰ τὴν τελειότητα τῆς βίης ἐπὶ τῆς κρίσεως ἢν ἡ μόνον οἱ ἡμέτεροι χριστοὶ κηρύττουσι προσημύοντες τὴν νόμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν νομοθέτες. ἢ σοφοί, ἢ ποιηταὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλόσοφοι οἱ τὴν ἀληθὴν καὶ δεῖαν ἐπαγγελίαν παρ' ὑμῶν εἰδέναι γνώσκοντες. Ad Græcos Cohort. 1. Tertullian shewes the same not only fr m th writings, but the constant conversation and language even of the Gentiles. Anima licet corporis carcere pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta, licet libidimbus & concupiscentiis evigorata, licet falsis Diis exancillata, cum tamen respiscit ut ex crapula, ut ex somno, ut ex aliqua valetudine, & sanitatem suam patitur & Deum nominat, hoc solo, quia proprie verus hic unus Deus bonus & magnus. Et quod Deus dederit, omnipotens est. Judicem quoque contestatur illum, Deus videt, & Deo commendo, & Deus mihi reddet. O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ! Apolog. adv. Gentiles. Indeed the Ancient Gentiles have express'd this judgement to come very exactly. A Philemon cited by Justin Martyr De Monarch. Dei, Ἐγὼ δίκης ἀρεταλῶς ὅς γὰρ πᾶσι δ' ὁρᾷ. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ δίκαιος καὶ θεὸς ἐξουσιεῖς, Ἄρτα ἂν ἀνέχοντο καὶ τῆς ἀποστρέψαι, καὶ. Μὴ δὲν πλακῆθῃς, ἔσθ' καὶ ἄνθρωποι καὶ χρίσις. Ἡ γὰρ πᾶσι

Οὗτος δ' παλιν λέγει, Οὐ τάνομα φοβερὸν, ἢ δ' ἀνομιάν μ' ἴσκι.
*And Plato especially hath delivered it according to their Notion most particularly;
 whose places to that purpose are faithfully collected by Eusebius and Theodoret, and
 may be read in them; Euseb. de Prepar. Evangel. lib. 11. cap. 38. & lib. 12. cap. 6.
 Theodor. Serm. de Fine & Judi m. Where after the citation of severall places he
 includes, Οὐτως ἀκριβῶς ἐπὶ δὲ ὁ Πλάτων ἐπὶ τὰ ἐν ᾧ κρίσις.*

But yet, beside the consideration of the eternall power
 of conscience in our selves, beside the intuition of that es-
 sentiall Attribute, the Justice, of God, which are sufficient
 arguments to move all men, we have yet a more neer and
 enforcing perswasion grounded upon the expresse deter-
 mination of the will of God. For the determinate counsell
 of the will of the Almighty actually to judge the world in
 righteousness is clearly revealed in his word. *It is appoint- Heb. 9. 27.*
ed unto men once to dye, but after this the Judgement.
 There is a death appointed to follow this life, and a judge-
 ment to follow that death, the one as certain as the other.
 For in all ages God hath revealed his resolution to judge
 the world. Upon the first remarkable action after the fall,
 there is a sufficient intimation given unto angry Cain, *If*
thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest
not well, sin lieth at the door; which by the most ancient
 interpretation signifieth a reservation of his sin unto the
 Judgement of the world to come.

Gen. 4. 7.

† So the Tar-
 gum of Jona-
 than renders it,

וְלֹא אֵין

וְלֹא אֵין עֲוֹנוֹךָ יִשְׁחָבֵק לְךָ חֹבוֹךְ וְאֵין לֹא תִּשְׁבֵּי עֲבוֹךְ בְּעֹלָמָא הָךְ לֹא
 If thou makest thy works good, shall not thy sin be
 forgiven thee? And if thou makest not thy works good in this world, thy sin
 is kept unto the day of the great judgement. *And the Jerusalem Targum yet more*
expressly, וְלֹא אֵין עֲוֹנוֹךָ יִשְׁחָבֵק לְךָ חֹבוֹךְ וְאֵין לֹא תִּשְׁבֵּי עֲבוֹךְ בְּעֹלָמָא הָךְ לֹא
 If thou makest thy works good in this world, shall it not be remitted and forgi-
 ven unto thee in the world to come? And if thou makest not thy works good in
 this world, thy sin shall be reserved unto the day of the great judgement. *In the*
same manner the Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos, : וְלֹא אֵין עֲוֹנוֹךָ יִשְׁחָבֵק לְךָ חֹבוֹךְ

Before the Flood *Enoch* prophesied of a Judgement to
 come, saying *Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of* Jude 4.

his Saints to execute judgement upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed; and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. His words might have an aime at the waters which were to overflow the world; but the ultimate intention look'd through that fire which shall consume the world preserv'd from water. The testimonies which follow in the Law and the Prophets, the predictions of Christ and the Apostles, are so many & so known, that both the number and the plainesse will excuse the prosecution. The throne hath bin already seen, the Judge hath appeared sitting on it, the books have bin already open'd, the dead small and great have bin seen standing before him: there is nothing more certain in the word of God, no doctrine more clear and fundamentall, then that of *eternall Judgement*. I shall therefore briefly conclude the first consideration from the internall testimony of the conscience of man, from the essentiall attribute, the justice, of God, from the clear and full revelation of the will and determination of God, that after death, with a reflection on this, and in relation to another life, there is a Judgement to come, there *shall* some person come to judge.

Our second consideration followeth; seeing we are so well assured that there shall be a judgement, who that person is which *shall come to judge*, who shall sit upon that throne, before whose tribunal we shall all appear, from whose mouth we may expect our sentence. Now the Iudiciary power is the power of God, and none hath any right to judge the subjects and servants of God, but that God whose servants they are. The law by which we are to be judged was given by him, the actions which are to be discusst were due to him, the persons which are to be tryed are subject to his dominion; God therefore is the *Judge of all*. He *shall bring every work into judgement with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be*

Heb. 12. 23.

Eccles. 12. 14.

evil; and so the last day, that *day of wrath* is the *revelation of the righteous judgement of God*. Now if God, as God, be the Judge of all, then whosoever is God is Judge of all men, and therefore being we have proved the Father and the Son, and shall hereafter also prove the Holy Ghost to be God, it followeth that the † Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost shall judge the world; because the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in respect of the same divinity have the same autocraticall power, dominion, and authority.

But notwithstanding in that particular day of the general judgement to come, the execution of this Iudiciary power shall be particularly committed to the Son, and so the Father and the Holy Ghost shall actually judge the world no otherwise but by him. For *God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained*. It is God who judgeth, it is Christ by whom he judgeth. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement to the Son. There is therefore an originall, supreme, autocraticall judiciary power; there is a judiciary power delegated, derived, given by commission. Christ as God hath the first together with the Father and the Holy Ghost; Christ as man hath the second from the Father expressly, from the Holy Ghost concomitantly. For the Father hath given him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of man; not simply because he is a man, therefore he shall be judge, (for then by the same reason every man should judge, and consequently none, because no man could be judged if every man should onely judge) but because of the three persons which are God, he onely is † also the Son of man, and therefore for his affinity

Rom. 2. 5.

† Πάρεστι πῶς ἐν τῇ κρίσει τῷ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πᾶντων πατὴρ, συγκατάθετος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ συμπάροντος Ἀγίου Πνεύματος.
S. Cyril Ca-
tech. 15.

A. 17. 31.

Joh. 5. 22.

Joh. 5. 27.

† This Explication I though necessary to insert, because it seems to me the only way to end

that controversy which is raised upon the interpretation of those words of S. John which we ordinarily read thus, 27. Καὶ ἡγοῦσθαι ἕδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν παρέχειν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν. 28. Μὴ δαυμάζειτε τὸ πνεῦμα. By which distinction those words because he is the Son of man have reference to the precedent sentence. But an-
E fff 3

bin

bin otherwise distinguished, Καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κείνῳ ποιῆν. "Οτι ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
 ἐστὶ καὶ Θεὸς καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς. So the old Syriack Translation, vers. 27. **ܐܘܬܝܪ ܕܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢ**
ܕܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢ and then vers. 28 **ܕܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢ ܕܢܝܢ**
 And S. Chrysostome is so earnest for this reading, that he chargeth the former dis-
 tinction upon Paulus Samosatenus; as invented by him in favour of his Heresie, that
 Christ was nothing else but purely man. "Οτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ καὶ Θεὸς καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ
 Πατρὸς ὁ Σαμοσατένης ἔχ' ἑταίρῳ, ἀλλ' ὡς; Ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κείνῳ
 ποιῆν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν. ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς ἀκολουθίαν ἔχοντες τὸ λεγόμενον (as he
 argues against that reading) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλαβε κείνῳ ὅτι ἀνθρώπος ὅτιν (as he
 τὸ ἐκείνου ποιῆσαι ἀνθρώπος ἐστὶν) καὶ τῶν (as he) ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἀρρήτου ὡς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν
 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ κείνῳ ὅτιν. Οὕτως οὖν ἀναγνώσκον, "Οτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι καὶ
 Θεὸς καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς. Euthymius followeth the distinction of S. Chrysostome, and Theo-
 phylact makes the same Argument, Χρὴ ὁ γινώσκων ὅτι Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατένης
 ψαλὸν ἀνθρώπου δογματίζων τὸ Κεῖνον ὡς ἀνθρώπου τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ
 Ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κείνῳ ποιῆν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ὁ καταδικάων τὸν
 αἵματος ἀρχὴν ἀνθρώπου τὸ, Μὴ Θεὸς καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς. Ἀντίστοιχον ὅτιν ὁ
 οὕτως ἀναγινώσκων, τὴν γὰρ κείνῳ τῷ υἱῷ ὁ Πατὴρ ἔδωκεν, ἔχ' ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου
 ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι Θεός. But though this division of the words be built by S. Chrysostome
 and Theophylact charged upon Paulus Samosatenus the Heretick, yet we find
 no other distinction in the ancient Copies; nor did the Ancient Latine Fathers any
 otherwise read it then that Paulus said. We must then acknowledge no other coherence
 then the ordinary, that God gave his Son power to judge because he was the Son of
 man. Nor need we to avoid the Argument of S. Chrysostome, change the ὅτι into
 καὶ ὅτι, the quia into quatenus, for it is not rendered as the absolute reason in it
 self, but in relation unto God, or the persons of the Trinity; the Father shall not
 judge, nor the Holy Ghost, because those two persons are onely God, but all judge-
 ment is committed to God the Son because he is the Son of man.

with their nature, for his sense of their infirmities, for his
 appearance to their eyes, most fit to represent the greatest
 mildnesse and sweetnesse of equity in the severity of that
 just and irrelative judgement.

Nor was this a reason onely in respect of us who are to
 be judged, but in regard of him also who is to judge;
 for we must not look onely upon his being the Son of man,
 but also upon what he did and suffer'd as the Son of man.
 He humbled himself so far as to take upon him our nature,
 in that nature so taken he humbled himself to all the infir-
 mities which that was capable of, to all the miseries which
 this life could bring, to all the pains and sorrows which the
 sinnes of all the world could cause; and therefore in re-
 gard

of his humiliation did God exalt him, and part of exaltation due unto him was this power of judging.

The Father therefore who is onely God, and never took *Jo. 5. 22, 25, 27.* upon him either the nature of men or Angels, *judgeth no man*; (and the same reason reacheth also to the Holy Ghost) *but hath committed all judgement to the Son*; and the reason why he hath committed it to him, is *because he is*, not onely the *Son of God*, and so truly God, but also the *Son of man*, and so truly man; because *he is that Son of man*, who suffered so much for the sonnes of men.

From whence at last it clearly appeareth not onely that it is a certain truth that Christ shall judge the world, but also the reasons are declared and manifested unto us why he hath that power committed unto him, why *He shall come to judge the quick and the dead*. For certainly it is a great demonstration of the justice of God so highly to reward that Son of man, as to make him Judge of all the world, who came into the world and was judged here; to give him absolute power of absolution and condemnation, who was by us condemn'd to dye, and dyed that he might absolve us; to cause all the sons of men to bow before his throne, who did not disdain for their sakes to stand before the Tribunall and receive that sentence, *let him be crucified*; which event as infallible, and reason as irrefragable, Christ himself did shew at the same

† Veniet Christus ut iudex
qui stetit sub
iudice: veniet
in ea forma in
qua iudicatus

est, ut videant in quem pupugerunt, & cognoscant Judæi quem negaverunt, convincat eos homo ille susceptus & ab eis crucifixus, *auth. lib. de symb. ad Catech. lib. 1. cap. 4.* Veniet ergo, fratres mei, veniet ille: qui prius venit occultus, veniet in potestate manifestus. Ille qui iudicatus est veniet iudicaturus. Ille qui stetit ante hominem iudicaturus est omnem hominem, *idem lib. 1. cap. 8.* Iudex hic erit filius hominis; forma illa hic iudicabit, quæ iudicata est. Audite & intelligite, jam hoc Propheta dixerat, *U debui in quem pupugerunt.* Ipsam formam videbunt, quam lancea percusserunt. Sedebit Iudex, qui stetit sub iudice. Damnabit veros reos qui factus est falsus reus. Ipse veniet, *quæ illa veniet*, S. Aug. *de Urbis Dom. Ser. m. 64.*

Mat. 26. 64.

time when he stood before the judgement seat, saying, *Ne-
verthelesse I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son
of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the
clouds of heaven.* Again, if we look upon our selves which
are to be judged, whom can we desire to appear before,
rather then him who is of the same nature with us? If the
children of *Israel* could not bear the presence of God as a
Law-giver, but desired to receive the law by the hand of
Moses; how should we appear before the presence of
that God judging us for the breach of that Law, were it
not for a better Mediator, of the same nature that *Mo-
ses* was and we are, who is our Judge? In this appeareth
the wisdom and goodnesse of God, that making a ge-
nerall Judgement, he will make a visible Judge, which
all may see who shall be judged. *Without holinesse no man
shall ever see God*; and therefore if God, as onely God,
should pronounce sentence upon all men, the ungodly
† should never see their Judge. But that both the righte-
ous and unrighteous might see and know who it is that
judgeth them, Christ who is both God and man is appoin-
ted Judge; so as he is man all shall see him, and as he is
God they onely shall see him who by that vision shall en-
joy him.

† Cum boni &
mali visuri
sunt judicem
vivorum, &
mortuorum,
proculdubio

cum videre non poterunt mali, nisi secundum formam qua filius hominis est;
sed tamen in claritate in qua judicabit, non in humilitate in qua judicatus est.
Ceterum illam Dei formam in qua æqualis est Patri proculdubio impii non vi-
debunt. Non enim sunt mundicordes, *Beati enim mundicordes quoniam ipsi vide-
bunt Deum*, S. Aug. de Trin. l. 1. c. 13. Hoc rectum erat ut judicandi viderent
Judicem. Judicandi autem erant boni & mali. *Beati enim mundo corde quoniam
ipsi Deum videbunt.* Restabat ut in judicio forma servi & bonis & malis ostenderetur,
forma Dei solis bonis servaretur, *Idem De Verbis Dom. Serm. 64. Et potes-
tatem dedit ei judicium facere quia filius hominis est.* Puto nihil esse ma-
nifestius. Nam quia Filius Dei est æqualis Patri, non accepit hanc potestatem
judicii faciendi, sed habet illam cum Patre in occulto. Accepit autem illam ut bo-
ni & mali eum videant judicantem, quia filius hominis est. Visio quippe Filii
hominis exhibebitur & talis. Nam visio formæ Dei non nisi mundis corde, quia
ipsi Deum videbunt, id est, solis piis exhibebitur, quorum dilectioni hoc ipsum
promittit quia seipsum ostendit illis, *Idem rursus de Trin. l. 1. c. 13.*

Christ

Christ Jesus then, the Son of God, and the Son of man, he which was *born of the Virgin Mary*, he which *suffered under Pontius Pilate*, he which *was crucified, dead and buried*, and *descended into hell*, he which *rose again from the dead*, *ascended into heaven*, and is *set down on the right hand of God*: He, the same person, in the same nature, shall come to *judge the quick and the dead*. For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his Angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. He then which is to come is the Son of man, and when he cometh, it is to judge. The same Jesus which was taken up from the Apostles into heaven, shall so come in like manner as they saw him goe into heaven. That Son of man then which is to judge is our Jesus, even the same Jesus, and shall come in the same manner, by a true and locall translation of the same nature out of heaven. For God will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead. He then which ascended into heaven was the same which was raised from the dead, and by that Resurrection God assured us that the same man should judge us. For to this end Christ both dyed and rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. It appeareth therefore by Gods determination, by Christs Resurrection and Ascension, that the man Christ Jesus is appointed Judge.

Mat. 16. 27.

Act. 10. 42.

Act. 17. 31.

Rom. 14. 9.

Mat. 3. 12.

Ἀνατρεψὲς τὴν κλίσιν ὧς περ, ὡς αὐθαΐει καὶ κρίτην δείκνυσιν, καὶ τὴν πλωσίαν ἀδελφῶν ἐσείζει.

S. Chrys. in loc.

G g g g

bunds

Mat. 13. 30, *bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn*
 39. Πάλιν ἀγα- and this *harvest is the end of the world*. He representeth
 μιμήσκει αὐ- himself under the notion of a Fisherman *casting a net into*
 τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάν- the sea; and *gathering of every kind*; which, when it was
 νη ῥημάτων ἁγίου full, he *drew to the shore and sat down and gathered the*
 κελτῶν αὐτῶν *good into vessels, but cast the bad away*. He is the Bride-
 οἱ παρόντων, S. groom who *took the wise virgins* *with him to the marri-*
 Chrys. ad locū. age, and *shut the door upon the foolish*. He is the man
 a Mat. 13. 47. who *travailing into a far countrey, delivered the talents to*
 48. his servants, and *after a long time cometh again, and re-*
 b Mat. 25. 10. *kan th with them*, exalting the good and faithfull, and
 Mat. 25. 19, casting the *unprofitable servant into outer darknesse*. Last-
 21, 30. ly, he is the Shepherd, and is so expressly described in re-
 lation to this judgement. For *when the Son of man shall*
 Mat. 25. 31, *come in his glory, and all the holy Angels with him, then*
 32, 33. *shall he sit down upon the throne of his glory. And before*
him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate
them one from another, as a Shepherd his sheep from the
goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the
goats on his left. Being then the Son of man is thus con-
stantly represented as making the great decretory separa-
tion, and the last judicatory distinction between man and
man, as an husbandman separating the wheat, sometime
from the chaff, sometime from the tares: as a Fisherman
gathering the good fish, casting the bad away; as a Bride-
groom receiving the wise, excluding the foolish virgins; as
a Master distinguishing the servants of his family, reward-
ing the faithfull, punishing the unprofitable; as a shep-
heard, dividing his sheep from the goats, placing one on
the right hand, the other on the left; it plentifully proveth
that the same Son of man is appointed the Judge of all the
sons of men. And thus it appeareth that Christ is he who
shall be the Judge, which is the second consideration sub-
servient to the present Explication.

Thirdly, it being thus resolved that the Son of man shall be the Judge, our next consideration is, what may the nature

nature of this Judgement be; in what that Judiciall acti-
 on doth consist; what he shall then doe; when *he shall*
come to judge. The reality of this Act doth certainly con-
 sist in the finall determination, and actuall disposing of all
 persons in soul and body to their eternall condition: and
 in what manner this shall particularly be performed is not
 so certain unto us; but that which is sufficient for us, it
 is represented under a formall judiciary processe. In which
 manner, *Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est; sed qui-*
busmodis & quo ordine veniant in his tunc docebit rerum experientia quam
nos valet consequi ad perfectum hominum intelligentia, De Civitate
lib. 2. cap. 30.

+ S. Austin
speaking of the
process
forwards to be
exhibited at the
day of Judge-
ment, concludes

there is described a throne, a tribunall, a judgement-
 seat; for *in the regeneration the Son of man shall sit in the* Mat. 19. 28. }
throne of his glory and that this throne is a seat not onely of
 Majesty but also of judicature, appeareth by the following
 words spoken to the Apostles, *ye also shall sit upon the*
twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. As in
 that vision in the Revelation, *I saw thrones and they* Rev. 20. 4, 11.
sate upon them, and judgement was given unto them.
I saw a great white throne, and him that sate on it,
from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away. This
 throne of Christ is expressly called his judgement seat; when
 the Apostle tells us, *we shall all stand before the judgement* Rom. 14. 10.
seat of Christ, and we must all appear before the judge- 2 Cor. 5. 10.
ment seat of Christ. In respect then of the Son of man, he
 shall appear in the proper form and condition of a Judge,
 sitting upon a throne of judicature. Secondly, there is to
 be a personall appearance of all men before that seat of
 judicature upon which Christ shall sit, for *we must all ap-*
pear, and we shall all stand before that judgement seat.
the dead, saith the Apostle, stand before the throne Rev. 20. 12.
of God. Thus all nations shall be gathered before him. He Mat. 25. 32.
shall send his Angels with a great sound of a trumpet, & they Mat. 24. 31.
shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from

2 Tess. 2. 1.

1 Cor. 4. 5.

Eccl. 12. 14.

Rev. 20. 12.

Mat. 24. 34.

41.

46.

one end of heaven to the other. For the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ is our gathering together unto him. Thirdly, when those which are to be judged are brought before the judgement seat of Christ, all their actions shall appear; he will bring to light the hidden things of darknesse, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts: he will bring every work into judgement with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. To this end, in the vision of Daniel, when the Judgement was set, the books were opened; and in that of S. John, the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works. Fourthly, after the manifestation of all their actions, there followeth a definitive sentence passed upon all their persons according to those actions; the sentence of absolution, in these words express'd, *Come ye blessed of my Father inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*; the sentence of condemnation, in this manner, *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his Angels*. Lastly, after the promulgation of the sentence followeth the execution. As it is written, *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternall*. Thus appeareth Christ's majesty by sitting on the throne, his authority by convening all before him, his knowledge and wisdom by opening all secrets, revealing all actions, discerning all inclinations, his justice in condemning sinners, his mercy in absolving believers, his power in the execution of his sentence. And thus the Son of man shall come to judge, which is the last particular subservient to the third Consideration of this Article.

The fourth and last consideration is, what is the object of this Action, who are the persons which shall appear before that Judge, and receive their sentence from him, what is the latitude of that expression, *the quick and the dead*. The phrase it self is delivered severall times in the Scriptures, and

and that upon the same occasion; for Christ was ordeined of God to be the judge of quick and dead. & so his commission extendeth to both: he is ready to judge the quick and the dead; his resolution reacheth to each: and as he is ordeined and ready, so shall he judge the quick and the dead, the execution excludeth neither. But although it be the Scripture language, and therefore certainly true; yet there is some ambiguity in the phrase, and therefore the intended sense not evident. The Holy Ghost speaketh of death in severall notions, which makes the quick and the dead capable of severall interpretations. Because after death the soul doth live, and the body onely remaineth dead; therefore † some have understood the souls of men by the quick, and their bodies by the dead: and then the meaning will be this, that Christ shall come to judge immediately upon the resurrection, when the souls which were preserved alive shall be joyned to the bodies which were once dead; and so men shall be judged entirely both in body and soul, for all those actions which the soul committed in the body. Now though this be a truth, that men shall be judged when their souls and bodies are united; though they shall be judged according to those works which their souls have acted in their bodies; yet this is not to be acknowledged as the interpretation of this Article, for two reasons; first, because it is not certain that all men shall dye, at least a proper death, so that their bodies shall be left any time without their souls; secondly, because this is not a distinction of the parts of man, but of the persons of men.

+ So Theophylact
last testifies,
πρὸς τὴν ψυ-
χὰς καὶ σωτηρίαν
ταῦτο ὁ λόγος,
Comment. in
2 Timoth. 4. 1.
Indeed Ildoro-
mus Pelusius a-
gives this as
the first Inter-
pretation, Τὸ
καὶ ἐκείνου ζήν-
τας καὶ νεκρὸς
οὐτὸ ἔστι, τὸ καὶ
ψυχῇ καὶ σω-
μᾷ ἢς κείων
ἐγγινομένη, καὶ
ἐπεὶ ἐν διατέλει
καὶ ζωῆς αὐτῶν
ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος

ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρθάνειαν συνάγουσιν ἐπιτήσαντο; ἔτι καὶ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν διέσωσεν ὑμῶν.
ἐπίκουρον, Epist. 222. lib. I.

Again, because the Scripture often mentioneth a death in trespasses and sinnes, and a living unto righteousness, others have conceived by the *quick* to be under-

† This is the
second exposition
delivered by I.

Isidorus Pelu-
siota, of such is
are not satisfied
with the first,
Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀγῶς
ζητήσας, ἔγωγε
ἀκείναι, ζών-
τας τὲς; ἀνέζω-
ο βίον καὶ θεο-
φιλή μετ' ἐθόν-
τας, καὶ ἀπο-
δύναται αὐτοῖς
ἀπὸ τῆς
ἀμοιβῆς, κρι-
ναι τὲς νεκρο-
θέντας τοῖς
σώματι
καὶ τὸ δὲ δέν αὐ-
τοῖς τάλαντον ὡς ἐν τάφῳ ἢ ἐαυτῶν κατὰ χρόνους ῥαθυμίας, καὶ ἀμύνηται
αὐτὲς, Epist. 222. lib. 1.

stood the † just, and by *the dead* the unjust: so that
Christ shall judge *the quick*, that is the just, by a sentence
of absolution, and *the dead*, that is the unjust, by a sentence
of condemnation. But, though the dead be sometimes ta-
ken for sinners, and the living for the righteous, though
it be true that Christ shall judge them both: yet it is not
probable that in this particular they should be taken in a
figurative or metaphoricall sense, because there is no ad-
junction giving any such intimation & because the literall sense
affordeth a fair explication; further yet, because the Scripture
in the same particular naming the quick and the dead suf-
ficiently teacheth us that it is to be understood of a corpo-
reall death, *Whether we live or dye*, saith the Apostle,
we are the Lords: for to this end Christ both dyed, and rose,
and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and
living.

* Rom. 14. 9.

* This is the
third Exposition
of Isidorus
Pelusiota,
Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀγῶς,
ἔτι καὶ κριναι
τὲς τότε ζών-
ται κατὰ χρό-

Thirdly therefore by ** the dead* are understood all those
who ever dyed before the time of Christs coming to judge-
ment, and by *the quick* such as shall be then alive: so that
the quick and the dead literally taken are considered in re-
lation to the time of Christs coming; at which time they
shall

θέντας, καὶ τὲς ἡδὴ περὶ αὐτῶν κακοιμούντας, Ibid. Others of the Fathers give the
second and the third explication leaving it indifferēt, and preferring neither; as S.
Chrysost. Ἦτοι ἀνθρώποις λέγει καὶ δικαίους, ἢτοι καὶ τὲς ἀπὸ θανάτου καὶ τὲς νῦν
ὄντας, ὅτι πολλοὶ κατὰ χρόνον ζῶντες, Com in 2. Tim. 4. 1. Duobus au-
tem modis accipi potest quod v. vos & mortuos judicabit; sive ut vivos intelliga-
mus quos hic nondum mortuos, sed adhuc in ista carne viventes inventurus est e-
jus adventus; mortuos autem qui de corpore priusquam veniat exire vel exituri
sunt: sive vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quoniam justique quique judica-
buntur, S. August. in Enchiridio, c. 54. Credimus etiam inde vivorum con-
venientissimo tempore, & judicaturum vivos & mortuos, sive istis nominibus justique
& peccatores significantur; sive quos tunc ante mortem nostram in terris inventu-
rus est appellati sunt vivi, mortui vero qui in ejus adventu resurrecturi sunt, 1de

Slide & Symb. cap. 8. Inde venturus iudic re vivos & mortuos. Vivos qui su-
perfuierint, mortuos qui præcesserint. Potest & sic intelligi, vivos, justos; mor-
tuos, injustos: utrosque enim iudicat sua cuique retribuens. Justis dicturus, est in
judicio, Venite benediciti, &c. Sinistris quid? Ite in ignem, &c. Sic iudicabun-
tur à Christo vivi & mortui. Author lib. 1. de Symb. ad Catechum. Duobus mo-
dis hæc sententia accipitur. Vivi & mortui in animo, item vivi & mortui in cor-
pore. In corpore secundum priorem, iudicabit vivos in anima credentes, & mor-
tuos in anima fidem nullam habentes: secundum posteriorem iudicabit vivos in
carne, quos præsentis invenerit ejus adventus; iudicabit & mortuos in carne,
quos resuscitaturus est Deus excelsus, Author lib. 4. de Symb. ad Catech. cap. 7.
But although these two Expositions were thus i. different, yet the former
ought by no means so to be received as any way to evacuate or prejudice the later. Quod
autem dicimus in Symbolo, in adventu Domini vivos ac mortuos iudicandos, non
solum justos & peccatores significari, sicut Diodorus putat; sed & vivos eos qui
in carne inveniendi sunt credimus, qui adhuc morturi creduntur, vel immutan-
di sunt, ut alii volunt, ut suscitati continuo, vel reformati, cum ante mortuis
juicentur, Gennadius de Dogmat. Ecclesiast. cap. 8.

shall be a generation living upon the face of the earth, and
 before which time all the generations passed since the cre-
 ation of the world shall be numbred among the dead. And
 this undoubtedly is the proper and literall sense of the Ar-
 ticle, that Christ shall come to judge, not onely those which
 shall be alive upon the earth at his appearing, but also all
 such as have liv'd and died before. None shall be then jud-
 ged while they are dead; whosoever stand before the
 judgement seat shall appear alive; but those which never
 died, shall be judged as they were alive; those which were
 dead before, that they may be judged, shall rise to life.
 He shall judge therefore *the quick*, that is those which shall
 be then alive when he cometh, and he shall judge *the*
dead, that is those which at the same time shall be raised
 from the dead.

* This is the
 clear intre preti-
 tion of Theo-
 doret, without
 the least menti-
 on of any other;
 Νεκρὸν καὶ
 ζῶσαν κρίνῃ
 τὸν Κύριον καὶ
 χλευῶν, ἐπι-
 δαὶ καὶ τὸς νε-
 κρὸς ἀνίστησι καὶ
 καὶ εἰς τὸ κρίτε-
 εἶον ἀγέρ, καὶ ἵδῃς

The

† This
 is the sense of Justin Mar-
 tyre, in his Questions and Answers under the name of Justin Mar-
 tyre, in the 4. 1. Vivos agnoscuntur qui in corpore erunt in adventu Domini, mortui
 ex hac luce migrave unt, Author Exp. Symb. sub nomine S. Chryl.
 Εἰ τὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δῶρον πάντες δύνανται ὁ Θεὸς δίδουαι ὑμῖν, καὶ
 πάντες ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς ἀναστάντες τῷ κυρίῳ παράσταθ μέλλουσιν, πῶς πληρωθήσονται
 καὶ κρίνῃ νεκρὸς καὶ ζῶντας τὸν Κύριον; πῶς ὁ νεκροὶ κερδήναι δυνήσονται,
 ὅν

ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ σώματα ἐν μνήμασιν ἔρρηται, αἱ δὲ ψυχὰς τῶν σωμάτων καὶ χωρισθῆναι
 εἰσὶν; Resp. Οὐ πάντες, φησὶ, κοιμηθῆσόμεθα· κείνοι οὖν ζῶντες ἔσονται, τὸς
 τότε ζῶντας, νεκροὺς δὲ, τὸς ἀνίστασθαι οὐκ ἔστι νεκρῶν, Quæst. 109.

† Omnium e-
 nim hominum
 erit resurre-
 ctio. Si omni-
 um erit, e go
 omnes moriun-
 tur, ut mors
 ab Adam du-
 ctæ omnibus
 filiis ejus domi-
 netur, & mane-
 at illud privile-
 gium in Domi-
 no, Non dabis
 Sanctum tuum
 videre corrup-
 tionem. Hanc
 rationem ma-
 xima Patrum
 turba tradente
 suscepimus,
 Genadius de
 Eccles. Dogmat.
 cap. 7.

a. 1 Theſſ. 4.
 15, 16, 17.

¶ This is the
 observation of
 Epiphanius,
 who from these
 words proves as
 much. For having repeated the text, he thus infers,

καὶ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἰδὲν τὰ ἐπιζῆσα. Διαρῶν γὰρ ὁ ἀγιος Ἀπὸστολος ἡμῶν
 τῶν πᾶν τὸ εἶδεν εἰς μίαν ἐλπίδα ζωῆσθαι, ἀπὸ τοῦ, ἡμεῖς ἀρπαγνόμεθα ἐν
 νεφέλαις εἰς ζωάντησιν αὐτῷ, ἵνα δόξῃ οὐρανὸς τὸ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἔχῃ ἕως
 τοῦ τῶτο, ὁ γὰρ ἀρπαγνὸς ἔπω τέθηκα, Hæres. 64. §. 70.

The onely doubt remaining in this interpretation is, whe-
 ther those that shall be found alive when our Saviour co-
 meth, shall still so continue till they come to judgement; or
 upon his first appearance they shall dye, and after death
 revive, and so together with all those which rise out of their
 graves, appear before the judgement seat. The considera-
 tion of our mortality, and the cause thereof, (that it is
 appointed for all men once to dye, in that death hath pass'd
 upon all) might perswade us that the last generation of
 mankind should tast of death as well as all the rest that
 went before it; and therefore it hath bin thought, espe-
 cially of late, that those whom Christ at his coming finds
 alive shall immediately dye; and after a sudden and uni-
 versall expiration shall be restor'd to life again, and joynd
 with the rest whom the graves shall render, that all may be
 partakers of the resurrection. But the Apostles descri-
 ption of the last day mentioneth no such kind of death, yea
 rather excludeth it. *a For we which are alive and remain
 unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which
 are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven
 with a shout with the voice of the Archangel and the trump
 of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we
 which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together
 with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so
 shall we be ever with the Lord.* In which words they

which remain unto the coming of the Lord, are not said to
 die or to rise from the dead, but are distinguished from
 those which are asleep, and rise first; yea being alive are
 caught up together with them, having not tasted death.

The same is further confirmed by the same Apostle, saying, *Behold I shew you a mystery we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.* Which being added to the former pointeth this doctrine out of question, for the living which remain at the coming of Christ are opposed to them which are asleep, and the opposition consists in this that they *shall not sleep*; which sleep is not opposed to a long death but to death it self, as it followeth, *the dead shall be raised incorruptible*, and we, (which shall not sleep) *shall be changed*; so that their mutation shall be unto them as a resurrection. And the collation of these two Scriptures maketh up this conclusion so manifestly,

1 Cor. 15. 51.

† Nam & in hoc ing. mi. ci-
mus, domitium
nostrium quod de
cælo est superin-
that dui desideran-

et siquidem exui & non nudi inveniamur; id est, ante volumus superinduere virtutem coelestem æternitatis; quam carne exuamur. Hujus enim gratiæ privilegium illos manet, qui ab adventu Domini deprehendentur in carne, & propter duritias temporum Antichristi merebuntur compendio mortis per demutationem expunctæ concurrere eum resurgentibus, sicut Thessalonicensibus scribit, Tertul. de Resur. Carn. c. 41. Sancti qui die consummationis atque judicii in corporibus reperti sunt cum aliis sanctis qui ex mortuis resurrecturi sunt, rapiuntur in nubibus obviam Christo in aera, & non gustabunt mortem; eruntque semper cum Domino, gravissima mortis necessitate calcata, unde ait Apostolus, *Omnes quidem non dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur.* Theodorus Heracleus Com. ad loc. apud S. Hieron. Epist. 152. Apollinarius licet aliis verbis eadem quæ Theodorus asseruit; quosdam non esse morituros, sed de præsentī vita rapiendos in futuram, ut mutatis glorificatisque corporibus sint cum Christo, S. Hieron. ibid. *Ὁ δὲ λέγει τὸ τόσον· ἔτι πάντες ἢ ἀποθανέμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀναστήσομεθα, καὶ οἱ μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντες· θνήσκουσιν ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ. Μὴ τίς μὲν, ἐπειδὴ ἀποθνήσκει, διὰ τὸ τόσον θνήσκει, φησὶν, ὡς ἐκ ἀποθανόντων. Εἰς ἃς τινὲς, εἰς, καὶ τὸ τόσον διαβύζονται, καὶ ὁμοῦς ἐκ ἀρκῆ τὸ τόσον αὐτοῖς οἷς τὸ ἀνδραγαθὸν ἐκείνων, ὡς καὶ εἰ καὶ ἐκείνα τὰ σῶματα τὰ μὴ ἀποθνήσκοντα ἀναγλυῶναι, καὶ εἰς ἀσπασίαν μεταπεσεῖν, S. Chryl. ad locum. So S. Jerome speaking of that place 1 Thess. 4. Hoc ex ipsius loci continentia sciri potest, quod Sancti qui in adventu Salvatoris fuerint deprehensi in corpore, in iisdem corporibus occurrant ei, tamen ut in glorium & corruptivum & mortale gloria & incorruptione & immortalitate mutetur: ut qualia corpora mortuorum surrectura sunt, in talem substantiam etiam vivorum corpora transformantur, S. Hieron. Epist. 148. ad Marcellam. And S. Austin in relation to the same place, Revera quantum ad verba beati Apostoli pertinet, videtur asserere quosdam in fine sæculi, adveniente Domino, cum futura est resurrectio mortuorum, non esse morituros, sed vivos repositos in illam immortalitatem quæ Sanctis etiam cæteris datur, repente mutan-*

H h h h

des,

dos, & simul cum illis rapiendos, sicut dicit, in nubibus. Nec aliquid aliud mihi visum est quoties de his verbis volui cogitare, S. Aug. ad tertiam Quæst. Dulcitii. *These and others of the Ancients have clearly delivered this truth, so that Gennadius, notwithstanding his maxima Patrum turba for the contrary, did not confess.* Verum quia sunt & alii æque Catholici & eruditi viri, qui credunt animam in corpore manente immutandos ad incorruptionem & immortalitatem eos qui in adventu Domini vivi inveniendi sunt; & hoc eis reputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem præsentis vitæ immutatione deponant, non morte. Quolibet quis acquiescat modo, non est hæreticus, nisi ex contentione hæreticus fiat, *De Eccles. Dogm. cap. 7.*

† There have
bin observed
three severall

that I conceive no man had ever doubted or questioned the
truth of it, had they not first differed in the † reading of the

Text.

readings of that place, 1 Cor. 15. 51. one of the Latine, two of the Greek. Illud autem breviter in fine commoneo; hoc, quod in Latinis codicibus legitur, *Omnes qui tem resurgemus, non omnes autem immutabimur*, in Græcis voluminibus non haberi, sed vel, *Omnes dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*; vel, *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur*, S. Hieron. Epist. 151. *But there was not one of these three onely in the Latine Copies, that is the first, but one which was in the Greek, was also in the Latine, that is the second. For both these S. Austin takes notice of.* Nam & illud quod in plerisque codicibus legitur, *Omnes resurgemus*, unde fieri poterit, nisi omnes moriamur? Resurrectio quippe, nisi mors præcesserit, nulla est. Et quod nonnulli codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*, multo facilius & apertius id cogit intelligi, *Ad 3. Quæst. Dulcitii.* Sed aliud rursus occurrit quod idem dicit Apostolus cum de resurrectione corporum ad Corinthios lequeretur, *Omnes resurgemus*, vel, sicut alii codices habent, *Omnes dormiemus*. Idem de Civit. Dei, lib. 20. cap. 20. *Two readings therefore were anciently in the Latine, two in the Greek; one of the Greek in the Latine and no more. First then that reading, Omnes quidem resurgemus, &c. which is at this day in the Vulgar Latine, was by the testimony of S. Jerome and S. Austin the ordinary reading in their times, and is also used by Tertullian, Horum demutationem ad Corinthios dedit, dicens, Omnes quidem resurgemus, non autem omnes demutabimur, De Resur. Carnis, c. 24. And although S. Jerome testifies that it was not to be found in the Greek Copies, yet to the same purpose it is amongst the Varie Lectiones March. Velef. Πατρος ἀναστεινόμεν, ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστασόμεθα. And i codice Claromontano, the Greek is erased in this place, but the Latine left is, Omnes quidem resurgemus. As for the second Reading, Omnes dormiemus, &c. this was anciently in the Latine Copies according to S. Austin, and also in the Greek, according to S. Jerome. Didymus did so read it, and contend for that reading, Scio quod in nonnullis codicibus scriptum sit, Non quid m omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur; Sed considerandum est an ei quod præmissum est, Omnes immutabimur, possit convenire quod sequitur, Mortui surgent incorrupti*

rapiti & nos immutabimur. Si enim omnes immutabuntur, & hoc commune cum ceteris est, superfluum fuit dicere, & nos immutabimur. Quamobrem ita legendum est, Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur, Apud S. Hieron. Epist. 152. Inderd Acacius Bishop of Cæsarea doth not onely acknowledge this Reading, but sayeth it was in most Copies. Dicamus primum de eo, quod magis in plurimis codicibus invenitur. Ecce mysterium dico vobis, Omnes quidem dormiemus, non omnes autem immutabimur. The Alexandrian MS may confirm this Lesson, which reads it thus, *Οἱ πάντες ἔτι ἐκοιμῶντο σπύδα, ἔτι πάντες ἔτι ἀναγινώσκουσα*, for the first *ἔτι* is not written in the line but above it. And the Æthiopick Version to the same purpose. Omnes nos moriemur, sed non omnes nos immutabimur. The third Reading, Non omnes dormiemus, &c. though it were not anciently in the Latine, yet it was frequently found in the Greek Copies. Acacius testifieth thus much, Transcamus ad secundam lectionem, quæ ita fertur in plerisque codicibus, Non qui cum omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur, apud Hieron. ibid. It was so anciently read in the time of Origen, as appeareth by the fragment taken by S. Jerome out of his *Egnyning* upon the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, which he mentioneth himself in his 2. book against Celsus. The same is acknowledged by Theodorus Heracleotes, Apollinarius, Didymus, S. Chrysostome, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Occumenius. The same is confirmed by the ancient Syriack Translation, *ܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܢܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܢܐܡܪܢܐ ܕܢܐܡܪܢܐ* as also by the Arabick. Being then of the three Readings but two were anciently found in the Greek Copies, Quæritis quo sensu dictum sit, & quo modo in prima ad Cor. Epistola Pauli sit legendum, Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur; an juxta quædam exemplaria, Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur; utrumque enim in Græcis codicibus invenitur, S. Hieron. ibid. being of those two but one is now to be found, and the Greek Fathers successively have acknowledged no other, being that which is left agrees with the most ancient Translations, we have no reason to doubt or question it.

Text. Wherefore being the place to the *Thessalonians* sufficiently proves it of it self, being that to the *Corinthians*, as we read it, invincibly confirmeth the same truth, I conclude that the living when Christ shall come, are properly distinguished from all those which dye before his coming; because death it self hath passed upon the one, & onely a change different from death shall passe upon the other; and so conceive that Christ is called the Lord and Judge of the quick and dead, in reference at least to this expression of the Creed. For although it be true of the living of any age to say that Christ is Lord and Judge of them and of the dead, yet in the next age they are not the living but the dead which Christ shall come to judge, and

H h h h a con-

consequently no one generation but the last can be the quick which he shall judge. As therefore to the interpretation of this † Article I take that distinction to be necessary, that in the end of the world all the generations dead shall be revived, and the present generation living so continued, and Christ shall gather them all to his tribunall seat, and so shall truly come to judge both *the quick and the dead.*

† This was well observed by S. Austin, Si autem in illis verbis Apostoli nullus alius sensus poterit

reperiri, & hoc eum intelligi voluisse clarum erit, quod videntur ipsa verba clamare; id est, quod futuri sint in fine seculi, & secundo adventu Domini, qui non expolientur corpore, sed superinduantur immortalitate, ut absorbeatur mortale a vita: huic sententiae proculdubio conveniet quod in Regula Fidei confitemur *viventium Dominum, judicatum vivos & mortuos*, ut non hic intelligamus vivos justos, mortuos autem injustos, quamvis judicandi sint & justis & injustis, sed vivos, quos nondum exiisse, mortuos autem, quos jam exiisse de corporibus, adventus ejus inveniatur, ad 3. *Quest. Dulcitii.* And Origen long before did make the same exposition of those words, That he might be Lord both of the dead and living, Rom. 14. 9. *Θεός γάρ ἐν τέττοις ὅτι ἀπέθανεν Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα νεκρῶν κυριεύσῃ, καὶ ἀίσῃ ἵνα μὴ μόνον νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. Καὶ οἳ δὲ γὰρ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι νεκροὺς μὴ ὡν κυριεύει ὁ Χριστός, τὸς ὅτι κατηλεγμένους ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους περτέρε (σήμερον γὰρ καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκτεθήσονται) ἀφάρτοι ζώντας ὅτι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐν ἀλαχυσμένους, ἐτέρους ὄντας ὅτι ἐλεγετο μὲν νεκρῶν, ἔχει ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἰσὺν ἡ λείξις ὅτις, Καὶ ἡμῖς ἀλαχυσόμεθα ἐξ ἡς οἰσμένη τῇ, Οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκτεθήσονται ὅτις. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεῖς περτέρε ἐν ἐτέροις λέξις πάλιν τὴν διαφορὰν παρὰ τὴν φησιν, ὅτις μὴ ὅτι τὸς κοιμωμένους, ὅτις ὅτις ζώντας ἀλγῶν, &c. l. 2. contra Cellsum. Which Exposition is far more proper than that of Methodius, 'Επὶ ὅτι ψυχῶν καὶ ἐπὶ ὅτι σωμάτων παλαιηθέντων ζώντων καὶ ὅτι ψυχῶν, καὶ δὲ ἀθάνατοι, νεκρῶν ὅτι σωμάτων, Phot. in Bibl. Cod. 234. and Rufinus, Quid autem dicitur judicare vivos & mortuos, nisi quod alii vivi alii mortui ad judicium veniant? sed animæ simul judicabuntur & corpora, in quibus vivos animas, corpora mortuos nominavit, *Expos. in Symb.**

Psal. 73. 20

To believe an universall Judgement to come is necessary, first, to prevent the dangerous doubts arising against the ruling of the world by the providence of God; that old rock of offence upon which so many souls have suffered shipwrack. That which made the Prophet David confesse, his feet were almost gone, his steps had well nigh slipped, hath hurried multitudes of men to eternall perdition. The conspicuous prosperity of the wicked, and apparent

miseria

miseries of the righteous, the frequent persecutions of virtue, and eminent rewards of vice, the sweet and quiet departures often attending upon the most dissolute, & horrid tortures putting a period to the most religious lives, have rais'd a strong temptation of doubt & mistrust whether there be a God that judgeth the earth. Nor is there any thing in this life considered alone, which can give the least rational satisfaction to this temptation. Except there be a life to come after such a death as we daily see, except in that life there be rewards and punishments otherwise dispensed then here they are, how can we ground any acknowledgement of an over-ruling justice? That therefore we may be assured that God who sitteth in heaven ruleth over all the earth, that a divine and most holy providence disposeth and dispenseth all things here below: it is absolutely necessary to believe and profess, that a just and exact retribution is deferr'd, that a due and proportionate dispensation of rewards and punishments is reserved to another world, and consequently that there is an Universal Judgement to come.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe a Judgement to come, thereby effectually to provoke our selves to the breaking off our finnes by repentance, to the regulating our future actions by the word of God, and to the keeping a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man. Such is the sweetnesse of our finnes, such the connaturalnesse of our corruptions, so great our confidence of impunity here, that except we looked for an account hereafter, it were unreasonable to expect that any man should forsake his delights, renounce his complacencies, and by a severe repentance create a bitterness to his own soul. But being once perswaded of a judgement, and withall possessed with a sense of our finnes, who will not tremble with Felix? who will not flee from the wrath to come? what must the hardnesse be of that impenitent heart which trea-

Rom. 2. 5.

revelation of the righteous judgement of God? We are naturally inclined to follow the bent of our own wills, and the inclination of our own hearts: all externall rules and prescriptions are burthensome to us; and did we not look to give an account, we had no reason to satisfie any other desires then our own: especially the dictates of the word of God are so pressing and exact, that were there nothing but a commanding power, there could be no expectation of obedience. It is necessary then that we should believe that an account must be given of all our actions; and not onely so, but that this account will be exacted according to the rule of Gods revealed will, that God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to the Gospell. There is in every man not onely a power to reflect, but a necessary reflexion upon his actions, not onely a voluntary remembrance, but also an irresistable judgement of his own conversation. Now if there were no other judge beside our own soules, we should be regardlesse of our own sentence, and wholly unconcern'd in our own condemnations. But if we were perswaded that these reflexions of conscience are to be so many witnesses before the tribunall of heaven, and that we are to carry in our own hearts a testimony either to absolve or condemn us, we must infallibly watch over that unquiet inmate, and indeavour above all things for a good conscience. For seeing that all things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godlinesse, looking for and hastning unto the coming of the day of God. Reason it self will tell us thus much; but if that doe not, or if we will not hearken to our own voice; the grace of God that bringeth salvation teacheth us, that denying ungodlinesse and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, it is necessary to professe faith in Christ as Judge

Rom. 2. 16.

2 Pet. 3. 11.

TIT. 2. 11, 12,
13.

Judge of the quick and the dead, for the strengthening our hope, for the augmenting our comfort, for the establishing our assurance of eternall life. If we look upon the Judgement to come, onely as revealing our secrets, as discerning our actions, as sentencing our persons according to the works done in the flesh, there is not one of us can expect life from that tribunall, or a happinesse at the last day. We must confesse that we have all sinned, and that there is not any sin which we have committed but deserves the sentence of death; we must acknowledge that the best of our actions bear no proportion to eternity, and can challenge no degree of that weight of glory; and therefore in a judgement, as such, there can be nothing but a fearfull expectation of eternall misery, and an absolute despair of everlasting happinesse. It is necessary therefore that we should believe that Christ shall sit upon the throne, that our Redeemer shall be our Judge, that we shall receive our sentence not according to the rigour of the law, but the mildnesse and mercies of the Gospell; and then we may look upon not onely the precepts but also the promises of God; whatsoever sentence in the sacred Scripture speaketh any thing of hope, whatsoever text administred any comfort, whatsoever argument drawn from thence can breed in us any assurance, we may confidently make use of them all in reference to the Judgement to come; because by that Gospel which contains them all we shall be judged. If we consider whose Gospell it is, and who shall judge us by it, *we are the members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones; for which cause he is not ashamed to call us brethren. As one of our brethren* he hath redeemed us, he hath laid down his life as a rancome for us. He is our High Priest who made an atonement for our finnes, *a mercifull and faithfull High Priest in all things, being made like unto his brethren.* He which is Judge is also our Advocate; and who shall condemn us, if he shall passe the sentence upon us, who maketh intercession for us? Well therefore may

Eph. 5. 30.

Heb. 2. 11.

Lev. 25. 48.

Heb. 2. 17.

Eph. 3. 12.

Joh. 5. 24.

may we have boldnesse and acceſſe with confidence by the faith of him unto the throne of that Judge, who is our Brother, who is our Redeemer, who is our High Priest, who is our Advocate, who will not by his word at the laſt day condemn us, becauſe he hath already in the ſame word abſolved us, ſaying *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life and ſhall not come into condemnation, but is paſſed from death unto life.*

Having thus explained the nature of the judgement to come and the neceſſity of believing the ſame, we have given ſufficient light to every Chriſtian to underſtand what he ought to intend, and what it is he profeſſeth, when he ſaith, I believe in him who *ſhall come to judge the quick and the dead.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I am fully perſwaded of this as of an infallible and neceſſary truth, that the eternall Son of God, in that humane nature, in which he dyed, and roſe again, and aſcended into heaven, ſhall certainly come from the ſame heaven into which he aſcended, and at his coming ſhall gather together all thoſe which ſhall be then alive, and all which ever lived and ſhall be before that day dead; when cauſing them all to ſtand before his judgement ſeat, he ſhall judge them all according to their works done in the fleſh; and paſſing the ſentence of condemnation upon all the reprobates, ſhall deliver them to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels, and pronouncing the ſentence of abſolution upon all the elect, ſhall tranſlate them into his glorious kingdome of which there ſhall be no end. And thus I believe in Jeſus Chriſt, *who ſhall judge the quick and the dead,*

ARTICLE

ARTICLE VIII.

I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST.

IN this Article we repeat again the first word of the Creed, *I believe*; whereas a Conjunction might have bin sufficient, but that so many particulars concerning the Son doe intervene. For as we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: so doe we make Confession of our faith, saying, *I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; and the Ancients, whose Creed was something shorter, made no repetition of the Act of faith, but onely an addition of the Object, *And in the Holy Ghost*. And as we repeat the Act of Faith in this Article, so some did also in the second, *I believe in Jesus Christ*. Wherefore being this word, *I believe*, is taken here onely by way of resumption or repetition, and consequently must be of the same sense and Importance of which it was in the beginning of the Creed, it may well receive the same explication here which it received there; to that therefore the Reader is referred.

For although the ^{**} Ancient Fathers did frequently make use of this language to prove the Divinity of the Spirit, and did thence argue that he is really and truly God,

because Spiritum San-

ctum, *Ruffinus in Symb. Max. Taurin. Author lib. de Symb. ad catechum.* The MS. in the Oxford Library, Et in Spiritu Sancto. Others instead of the Conjunction made use of Credo by way of repetition. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum, *Chrysost. Euseb. Gallican. Author Serm. de Tempore, Eusebius Oxon. the Greek and Latine MS. in Bennet Colledge Library, and Credo in Sancto Spiritu, Venantius Fortunatus.*

As the Ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus. ^{**} Gregory Nazianzene disputing for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, proveth that he is no creature, thus, Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκτισμένος, πῶς οὐκ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα θεοῦ; ἢ οὐ αὐτὸ τέλει μένει; ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸν θεὸς πνεύματι πνεύματι, καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸ πνεύματι. Ἰδὲ αὖτε ὁ θεὸς διότι τὸ πνεύματι πνεύματι, Οὐαί. 37. Epiphanius seems to speak thus, shewing that though the Fathers of the Nicene Council had determined nothing particularly of the Holy Ghost, yet they sufficiently shew that he is God by those words,

καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Εὐθὺς γὰρ ἡ ἑκδοσις ὁμολογεῖ καὶ ἔκ ἀρχῆς. Πιστεύομεν
 γὰρ εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα. Τὸ δὲ πιστεύομεν ἔκ ἀπλῶς εἰρηται ὁ
 ἡ πίστις εἰς τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ, εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἔκ ἀπλῶς εἰρηται ὁ
 εἰς Θεὸν ἡ πίστις. Καὶ, εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἔκ ἀπλῶς εἰρηται ὁ
 αὐτοδουλοῦν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἑνωσιν θεότητος καὶ μίαν ὁμολογήσιν, εἰς τὰ τέσσαρα
 μίαν δὲ θεότητα, μίαν ὕσιν, μίαν δουλοῦν, μίαν κυριότητα, ὑπὸ τῷ πνεύματι
 καὶ πιστεύομεν καὶ πιστεύομεν. *Hanc. 74. Agnoscamus verbi ipsius privilegium.*
Credere illi quilibet potest hominum, credere vero in illum soli debere te Ma-
gnati noveris. Sed & hoc ipsum aliud est Deum credere, aliud est credere in Deum.
Esse Deum & Diabolus credere dicitur, secundum Apostolum; nam & daemones
credunt & contremiscunt. In Deum vero credere, hoc est fideliter eum quærere,
& tota in eum dilectione transire. Credo ergo in illum hoc est dicere, Confiteor il-
lum, colo illum, adoro illum, totum me in jus ejus ac dominium trado, atque
transfundo. In professionis hujus reverentia universa divino nomini debita con-
vinentur obsequia, Paschasius in Praefat. Operis de Spiritu S.

because we *believe in the Holy Ghost*; yet being that lan-
 guage is not expressly read in the Scriptures in relation to
 the Spirit, as it is in reference to the Son, being to be-
 lieve in the Holy Ghost is onely the expression of the
 Church contained in the Creed, being in the same Creed
 many of the Ancients, without any reprehension, have u-
 sed the same phrase in the following Articles expressly, and
 where the preposition is not expressed, it may very well
 be thought it was understood; therefore I think fit to ac-
 quiesce in my former exposition, and lay no greater force
 in the preposition.

It will therefore be sufficient for the explication of this
 Article, if we can declare what is the full and proper ob-
 ject of our Faith contained in it, what we are obliged to
 believe concerning *the Holy Ghost*. And as to this we
 shall discharge our undertaking, and satisfy whatsoever
 is required in this Exposition, if we can set forth these two
 particulars, the Nature and the Office of that blessed
 Spirit. For the name of **G**host or **G**ast in the ancient
Saxon language signifieth a Spirit, and in that appella-
 tion of the Spirit of God, his nature principally is express'd.
 The addition of holiness though it denote the intrinsecall
 sanctity essentially belonging to that Spirit, yet notwith-
 standing

standing it containeth also a derivative notion, as signifying an emanation of that holiness, and communication of the effects thereof, and in this communication his Office doth consist. Whatsoever therefore doth concern the Spirit of God, as such, and the intrinsecall sanctity which belongeth to that Spirit, may be expressed in the explication of his Nature; whatsoever belongeth to the derivation of that sanctity, may be described in his Office; and consequently more cannot be necessary then to declare what is the Nature, what the Office of the Spirit of God,

For the better indagation of the Nature of the Holy Ghost, I shall proceed by certain steps and degrees, which as they will render the discourse more clear, so will they also make the reasons more strong, and the arguments more evident. And first, as to the existence of the Spirit of God; it will be unnecessary to endeavour the proof of it; for although the *Sadduces* seemed to deny it, who said that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; though it hath † bin ordinarily concluded from thence that they rejected the Holy Ghost, yet it cannot be proved from those words that they denied the existence of the Spirit of God, any more then that they denied the existence of God, who is a Spirit; nor did the Notion which the *Jews* had of the Spirit of God any way encline the *Sadduces*, who denied the existence of the angels and the soules of men, to reject it. The Resurrection, Angel, and Spirit, which the *Sadduces* refused to acknowledge, were but two particulars, for it is expressly added that the *Pharisees* confessed both; of which two, the Resurrection was one, * Angels and Spirits were the other; wherefore that which the *Sadduces* disbelieved was the existence of such created spirituall natures, as the Angels and the soules of men are conceived to have. And as for those disciples at

Act. 23. 8.

† As Epiph.

Heret. 14.

Πνεῦμα ἀγίου

ἐκίστην. And

Gregory Na-

zianzenes; Τὸ

Πνεῦμα τὸ ἁ-

γιον Σαδδου-

καῖσι ἢ ὡς ἔστι

τὸ πνεῦμα ἐ-

νόμιον (ὡς ἔ-

στι ἀγγέλους, ὡ-

ς ἀνθρώπων)

ἐκ οὐκ ὅτι

ταῖς τοσούταις

ἐν αὐτῷ μυσ-

τήριας τῇ

ποταμῷ δια-

κρίνεται,

Orat. 37.

* Φαρισαῖοι δ', φησὶν, ὁμολογεῖσι τὰ ἀμφοτέρω· καὶ μὴν, τείνα

ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀγγέλοις ἐστίν, S. Chrys. ad locum.

Ephesim,

Act. 19. 2.

Ephesus, who had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost, if they were Gentiles, it is no wonder, because they never had that notion in their religion; if they were Jews, as they seem to be, because they were baptized with the baptism of John, it signifieth not that they never heard of the Spirit of God, but onely that they had not heard of the giving of it, which the Apostle mentioned.

Joh. 7. 39.

As we read elsewhere, that *the Holy Ghost was not yet*; not denying the existence, but the plentiful effusion of it. Howsoever, the Apostle asked those ignorant Disciples, *Unto what then were ye baptized?* intimating that if they were baptized according to the rule of Christ, they could not be ignorant that there is an Holy Ghost; because the Apostles were commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It is therefore presumed that every one who professeth the name of Christ, from the first baptismal institution acknowledgeth that there is an Holy Ghost; and the onely question consists in this, what that Holy Ghost is, in whole name we are baptized and in whom according to our baptism we profess to believe.

To conclude
the Nature of
the Holy Ghost,
which is not so
immediately ex-
pressed in the
Scriptures, it
will be needfull
so to place our
assertions as
they may rectifie

to all other misconceptions. Now the old Notions, and more they can or now have, we thus deliver'd by Gregory Nazianzene, that great Divine so much concern'd in this Subject. Τὸν δὲ καὶ ἡμᾶς σφῶν οἱ μὲν οὐκ ἐγερσαν τὸ (τὸ πνεῦμα) ὑπολάβειν, οἱ δὲ χρίσμα, οἱ δὲ Θεὸν, οἱ δὲ ἐκ ἐξωθεν ὁπότερον τύπων, αἰδοῦν τὸ καθεῖναι, ὡς φασιν, ἑτέρον σφῶς δαλωσάντων, Orat. 37. These were the three particular and opposite Opinions, either the Spirit is an operation, or a created substance, or God; the fourth is but a doubt or hesitation which of the three is true. The first of these is thus propounded by way of question, Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄχρον ἢ ἡσὶ καὶ ἑαυτὸ ὑποσηκόντων πάντως ὑποδετέον, ἢ ἡσὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ θεῶν ὑπομένων, ὡν τὸ μὲν ὑποσηκόντων οἱ σφῶν ταῦτα διανοοῦν, τὸ δὲ συμβεβηκός. Either it is subsisting in it self, as a substance, or in another, as an accident. This was the first question then, and still is.

and doe even so. From whence it is evident that the evil Spirits from God were certain persons, even bad Angels, to which the one good spirit as a person is opposed, departing from him to whome the other cometh.

- Again, the New Testament doth describe the Holy Ghost by such personall dispositions, and with such operations, as are as evident marks and signes of a person as any which are attributed to the Father or the Son, which are unquestionable persons; and whatsoever terms are spoken of the Spirit by way of quality, are spoken as well of those which are acknowledged persons. We are exhorted by the Apostle *not to grieve the Spirit of God*, and grief is certainly a personall affection of which a quality is not capable. We are assured that the same *spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered*; & we can understand what are interceding persons, but have no apprehension of interceding or groaning qualities. The operations of the Spirit are manifest, and as manifestly personall: for he *searcheth all things, yea even the deep things of God*, and so he knoweth all things, *even the things of God*; which can be no description of the power of God; he *worketh all the spirituall gifts dividing to every man severally as he will*; in which the operation, discretion, distribution, and all these voluntary, are sufficient demonstrations of a person. He revealeth the will of God and speaketh to the sonnes of men, in the nature and after the manner of a person, *for the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee. Arise therefore and get thee down, and goe with them doubting nothing, for I have sent them*: and the Holy Ghost said unto the Prophets and teachers at Antioch, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them*. We cannot better understand the Nature of the Holy Ghost then by the description given by Christ which sent him: and he said thus to his Disciples. *The Comforter (or the Advocate) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send*
- Eph. 4. 30.
- Rom. 8. 26.
- 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.
- Act. 10. 19.
- Act. 13. 2.
- Joh. 14. 26.

and in my name, he shall teach you all things, he shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness. If I goe not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you. And when he is come he will reprove the world, and he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he shall shew you things to come; he shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All which words are nothing else but so many descriptions of a person, a person hearing, a person receiving, a person testifying, a person speaking, a person reproofing, a person instructing.

15. 26, 27.

16. 7, 8, 13, 14.

† The present Adversaries to this truth are the Socinians, and their opinion was thus first delivered by Socinus, Quod in testimoniis sacris quæ adversarii citant Spiritui S. actiones tribuuntur, & ea quæ personarum sunt propria, ex hoc nihil concludi potest, cum a-

The † Adversaries to this truth acknowledging all these personall expressions, answer that it is ordinary in the Scriptures to find the like expressions, which are proper unto persons, given unto those things which are no persons: as when the Apostle saith *a Charity suffereth long and is kind, charity envicth not, charity vaunteth not it self, is not puffed up, doth not behave it self unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh none evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity but rejoiceth in the truth beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.* All which personall actions, are attributed to charity which is no person, as in * other cases it is usuall, but

rebus quas personas non esse constat, similiter in Scripturis sacris actiones tribuuntur, & ea quæ sunt propria personarum. Cujus rei plenissimam fidem facere potest vel locus ille Pauli 1 Cor. 13. a v. 4. ad 8. ubi perpetuo de Charitate, tanquam de persona aliqua loquitur, illi permulta tribuens, quæ revera non nisi in personam cadunt, Faustus Socinus contra Wickum, c. 10. a 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. So the Racovian Catechism doth enlarge this Answer, stating the question thus, Qui vero in Scripturæ loci accipiendi sunt in quibus Sp. S. actiones personarum propriæ ad Deum ipsum spectantes attribuuntur? And returning this solution, Ad eum modum, quod in Scripturis rebus id attribuitur sæpenumero, quod personarum est, nam tamen res illæ propterea personæ censentur, ut peccato, quod deceperis, & occideris, Rom 7. 11 & legi, quod loquatur, Rom 3. 19. & Scripturæ quod prospiciat & puniat, Gal. 3. 8. & Charitati quod sit longanimis, &c. 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. Denique Spiritui, i. e. vento, quod spiraret ubi vellet, Cap. vi.

belongs.

* Quod si quis dixerit satis constare Paulum eo in loco figurate loqui, & charitatis nomine eam intelligere qui charitate est præditus, quatenus ea est præditus: Respondendo, Cum Spiritus S. sit Spiritus Dei, certumque sit alioqui spiritum alicujus personæ non posse esse personam ab ea cujus est Spiritus distinctam, non minus constare cum Spiritui S. ea tribuuntur, quæ personæ & simul ipsius Dei sunt propria, nihil aliud intelligendum nomine

Spiritus S. esse, quam ipsum Deum spiritu suo, id est, virtute atque efficacia sua, agentem atque operantem. *F. Socinus ibid.* Quoniam vero Spiritus S. virtus Dei est, hinc fit ut ea quæ Dei sunt, Spiritui S. attribuantur, & sub nomine Spiritus S. sæpe Deus ipse intelligatur, quatenus suam virtutem Deus per Spiritum suum exercit, *Catech. Ruv. ibid.*

belonging to that person which is charitable; because that person which is so qualified doth perform those actions according to, and by virtue of, that charity which is in him. In the same manner, * say they, personall actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost, which is no person, but onely the virtue, power, and efficacy of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; because that God the Father is a person and doth perform those personall actions, attributed to the Holy Ghost, by that virtue, power, and efficacy in himself which is the Holy Ghost. As when we read *the Spirit said unto Peter, Behold three men seek thee; arise therefore & get thee down and goe with them doubting nothing; for I have sent them:* we must understand that God the Father was the person which spake those words, & which sent those men; but because he did so by that virtue which is the Holy Ghost, therefore the Holy Ghost is said to speak those words and send those men. In the same manner when we read, *the Holy Ghost said unto those at Antioch, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them,* we must conceive it was God the Father who spake those words, who had called *Barnabas and Saul*, and to whom they were to be separated; but because God did all this by that power within him which is his Spirit, therefore those words and actions are attributed to the Holy Ghost. This is the summe of their answer; and more then this I conceive cannot be said in answer to that Argument which we urge from those personall expressions attributed to the Spirit of God, and, as we believe, as to a person.

But this Answer is most apparently insufficient, as giving no satisfaction to the Argument. For if all the personall

sonall actions, attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, might proceed from the person of God the Father, according to the power which is in him, then might this answer seem satisfactory; but if these actions be personall, as they are acknowledged and cannot be denied, if the same cannot be attributed to the Person of God the Father, whose spirit it is, if he cannot be said to doe that, by the power within him, which is said to be done by the Holy Ghost, then is that defence not to be defended; then must the Holy Ghost be acknowledged a person. But I shall clearly prove, that there are severall personall attributes given expressly to the Holy Ghost, which cannot be ascribed to God the Father, which God the Father by that power which is in him cannot be said to doe; and consequently cannot be any ground why those attributes should be given to the Spirit if it be not a person.

To make intercession is a personall action, and this action is attributed to the Spirit of God, *because he maketh* Rom. 8. 27. *intercession for the Saints according to the will of God.* But to make intercession, is not an act which can be attributed to God the Father, neither can he be said to intercede for us according to that power which is in him; and therefore this can be no *Prosopopeia*, the Holy Ghost cannot be said to exercise the personall action of intercession for that reason because it is the spirit of that person which intercedeth for us. To come unto men, as being sent unto them, is a personall action, and so the Comforter, or Advocate, who is the Holy Ghost, did come being sent; *when the Comforter is come whom I will send you from the Father*, saith Christ, and again, *If I goe not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him to you.* But to come unto men as being sent, cannot be ascribed to God the Father, who sendeth, but is never sent; especially in this particular, in which the Father is said expressly to send, and that in the name of the Son (*whom the Father will send in my name*, saith our Saviour.)

† The Opinion of the Jews was, that the Holy Ghost was nothing else but the afflatus or energy of God, and therefore they which denied the substantiality of the Spirit were look'd upon as symbolizing with the Jews in this particular. Lactantius in libris suis, & maxime in Epistolis ad Demetrianum Spiritus S. omnino negat substantiam; & errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad Patrem referri, vel ad Filium, & sanctificationem utriusque Personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari, S. Hieron. Epist. 99. Moses Maimonides sufficiently declareth the opinion of the Jews, who delivering the severall significations of *אֵל*, maketh the fifth and sixth to be these, Quinto significat Influentiam illam intellectualem divinam à Deo Prophetis instillatam, cujus virtute prophetant. Sexto significat Propositum, & Voluntatem. And then concludes, Vox hæc *אֵל* quando Deo attribuitur, ubiq; sumitur partim in quinta, partim in sexta significatione, quatenus voluntatem significat, More Hevobim, p. 140.

our.) When therefore the Holy Ghost cometh to the sons of men, as sent by the Father in the name of the Son, and sent by the Son himself, this personall action cannot be attributed to the Father as working by the power within him, and consequently cannot ground a *Prosopopeia*, by which the virtue or power of God the Father shall be said to doe it. To speak and hear are personall actions, and both together attributed to the Spirit, in such a manner as they cannot be ascribed to God the Father. When he, saith Christ, *the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that he shall speak.* Now to speak and not of himself cannot be attributed to God the Father, who doeth all things of himself; to speak what he heareth, and that of the Son; to deliver what he receiveth from another, and to glorifie him from whom he receiveth by receiving from him, as Christ speaketh of the Holy Ghost, *He shall glorifie me for he shall receive of mine, and shew it to you,* is by no means applicable to the Father; and consequently it cannot be true that the Holy Ghost is therefore said to doe these personall actions, because that person, whose Spirit the Holy Ghost is, doth those actions by and according to his own power, which is the Holy Ghost. It remaineth therefore that the Answer given by the Adversaries of this truth is apparently insufficient, and consequently that our Argument, drawn from the personall actions attributed in the Scriptures to the Spirit, is sound and valid. From whence I conclude against the Socinians and the Jews, that the Holy Ghost is not a quality, but a Person, which is our first Assertion.

Our second Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is not a created, but a divine and uncreated, Person. And for the proof of this Assertion, we shall first make use of that Argument which our Adversaries have put into our hands. The Spirit of God which is in God is not a created person. But the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God which is in God, and therefore not a created person. This argument is raised from those words of the Apostle, *For who knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God.* That this Spirit of God is the Holy Ghost I find denied by none. That the same spirit is in God, appeareth by the Apostles discourse, and is granted by the † Socinians: that it is so the Spirit of God, and so by nature in God that it cannot be a creature, is granted by the same. It followeth therefore undeniably that the Holy Ghost is no created person; inas-

I Corinth. 2. 11.

† The Socinians endeavouring to prove from this place that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, lay the foundation of their Argument in this,

that he is the spirit of God, and by nature in God, so that those things which are proper to the divine nature are attributed and belong to him, and because there is another person in the divine essence, & as they say, there can be but one, therefore the Holy Ghost is not a Person. Deinde idem (sc. Sp. S. non esse pers. nam) ex eo patet, quod non fit extra Deum natura sed in ipso Deo. Nisi enim natura Deo inesset, non potuisset Paulus Spiritum Dei cum spiritu hominis qui homini inest natura conferre, idque eo in loco, I Cor. 2. 11. ubi ait, *Quis hominum novit quae sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui est in homine? ita quae sunt Dei nemo novit nisi Spiritus Dei.* Quoniam vero Spiritus S. in Deo est, nec tamen in Spiritu S. reciproce dici potest esse Deum, hinc apparet Sp. S. non esse Personam. Præterea cum superius demonstratum sit unitatem tantum esse in Deitate personam, & Spiritus S. sit Dei virtus, ut verba Christi ad Apostolos indicant, *Luc. 24. 49. efficitur Spiritum S. esse personam divinam. Denique si Spiritus S. esset persona, essentiam quoque divinam cum habere oporteret. Nam ea attribuantur illi quæ propria sunt essentiae divinae: ac superius docuimus substantiam divinam unam esse numero, nec tribus personis esse posse communem. Quamobrem Sp. S. non esse Deitatis personam planum est, Catech. Rochon. c. 6. To the same purpose Socinus argue against Wickus, that the nature of the spirit is the nature of God, & that the spirit cannot therefore be a person, because there can be but one person in the nature of God. Whereas therefore independently from this place we have proved that the Holy Spirit is a person, & from this place have infer'd with them, that the same spirit is in God & of the divine nature, it followeth that he is no created spirit, inasmuch as the divine nature cannot be created.*

Kkkk 2

much

much as that cannot be a created person which hath not a created nature, & that cannot have nor be a created nature, which by nature is in God. Wherefore although it be replied by others, that it is not said in the text that the spirit is in God, yet our Adversaries reason overweighs their negative observation; and it availeth little to say that it is not express'd, which must be acknowledged to be understood. The Holy Ghost then is a person, (as I have proved) and is not of a nature distinguished from that which is in God, (as is confessed, and onely denyed to be in God, because it is not said so when it is implied,) therefore he is no created Person.

* Mat. 12. 31.

32. Quomodo
audent inter
omnia numera-
re Spiritum S.
quando ipse
Dominus dixe-
rit, *Qui blas-
phemaverit in
Filium hominis
remittetur ei,
qui autem blas-
phemaverit in
Spiritum S. nec
hic nec in sae-
culum remittetur
ei.* Quomodo i-
gitur inter cre-
aturas audet
quisquā Spiritū
computare?
Aut quis sic se
obligat, ut si
creatura dero-
gaverit, non
putet sibi hoc
aliqua venia
relaxandum?
S. Ambrose
De Spiritu S.
lib. 1. cap. 3.

Secondly, the Holy Ghost is such a Person, as against whom a sin may be committed, and when it is so, cannot be remitted. But if he were no Person, we could not commit that sin against him, and if he were a created Person, the sin committed against him could not be irremissible. Therefore he is a Person, and that uncreated. The Argument is grounded upon the words of our Saviour, * *All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world neither in the world to come.* By which words it appeareth there is a sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost distinct from all other finnes and blasphemies committed against God the Father or the Son of God; that this sin hath an aggravation added unto it beyond other finnes and blasphemies: but if the Holy Spirit were no person, the sin could not be distinct from those finnes which are committed against him whose Spirit he is; and if he were a person created, the sin could receive no such aggravation beyond other finnes and blasphemies. To this they answer, that the sin against the Holy Ghost is not therefore unpardonable, because he is God, which is not

to our purpose ; but they doe not , cannot shew that it can be unpardonable if he were not God. It is not therefore simply , and for no other reason , unpardonable, because that person is God against whom it is committed ; for if so, then any sin committed against any person which is God would be unpardonable ; which is false. But that sin, which is particularly called the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, is a sin against God, and in such a manner aggravated, as makes it irremissible ; of which aggravation it were incapable, if the Spirit were not God.

Thirdly, every created person was made by the Son of God as God , and is now put under the feet of the Son of God as man. But the Spirit of God was not made by the Son of God , nor is it now put under the feet of the Son of man. Therefore the Spirit of God can be no created person. *All things were made by the Word, and without him was not any thing made that was made ;* therefore every created person was made by the Word. God hath put all things under the feet of Christ , and when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him : and being none is excepted beside God , every created person must be under the feet of the Son of man. But the Spirit of God in the beginning was not made, yea rather in the beginning made the world, as Job speaks of God , *By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens ;* nor is he under the feet of Christ, now set down at the right hand of God , who with supreme authority together with the Father sent the Pro-

Joh. 1. 3.

1 Cor. 15. 27.

Job 26. 13.

Those which
anciently did
believe the Spi-
rit of God to be
phets, a created per-

son, did also teach that he was made by the Son, as Epiphanius testifieth of the Arians. Πανσι τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὄντι ὅτι ὁμολογεῖν τὸν ἀγίου πνεύματος ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ ὅτι καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐβλάστησεν καὶ τοῦ αἵματος ἀγαθὴν κακίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ, Har. 69. § 52. Ariani ab Ario, in eo sunt notissimi errore quo Patrem & Filium, & Spiritum S. nolunt esse unius ejusdemque naturæ, sed esse Filium creaturam, Sp. vero S. creaturam creaturæ, hoc est, ab ipso Filio creatum volunt, S. August. Har. 49. As Eusebius, τὸ δὲ ἐκκλητικὸν Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ὅτε Θεός, ὅτε υἱός, ἢ καὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν εἴληψεν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἡμετέρας συγχάνει, ὅτι ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ διὰ αὐτοῦ.

αὐτῷ ἐγένετο ἔδῃ ἐν, De Eccl. Theolog. lib. 3. cap. 6. Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς μὴ παρρη-
 θεύῃ τε τιμωρὸς ποιντικὸς αἰὶν καὶ δημιουργητικὸς τῆς ᾧ ἡμετέρας ἀπο-
 των, ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἀποστόλων, καὶ διὰ καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς Πνεύματος
 παρρησίας· πάντα γὰρ δι' αὐτῷ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὡς αὐτῷ ἐγένετο ἔδῃ ἐν, ibid. Where
 it is worth our Observation, that Eusebius citing the place of S. John, to prove that
 the Holy Ghost was made by the Son, leaves out those words twice together by which
 the Catholicks used to refute that heresie of the Arians, viz. ὁ γάρων. All things
 which were made were made by the Son, but the Holy Ghost was not among them
 γάρων, which were made, and therefore was not made by the Son. Τὸ Ἅγιον γὰρ
 Πνεῦμα κτισμα πάλιν κτισμάτος φασιν ἐν, διὰ τὸ, διὰ τοῦ καὶ τὰ πάντα γε-
 γνηῆσθαι, ὡς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ἀσωτίως ἱναὶ διαπαύζοντες, ἡ καὶ οὐρανὸν
 τὸ ῥητὸν ἔχοντες, ὡς καὶ κακῶς ὑπονοοῦντες, καὶ ὑπὸ ῥητὸν τὸ καλῶς οἰκουμενὸν καὶ
 πῶν κακὴν αὐτῷ ὑπονοοῖαν παρερμηνεύοντες· καὶ τὸ δὲ θεῖον Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ
 Πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὅ, ὡς καὶ πρὸ πάντων ἡμῶν κακισμένων, ὅτι οἱ τι κτιστὸν διὰ τοῦ Λό-
 γου γέγονεν, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Λόγου· τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' αὐτῷ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὡς αὐτῷ ἐ-
 γένετο ἔδῃ ἐν, παρεκτινόμενης τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἔχει, ὁ γάρων, ἵνα ἔτω γιν-
 ὄν, ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτῷ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὡς αὐτῷ ἐγένετο ἔδῃ ἐν, Epiphan.
 Hæres. 69. §. 56.

phets, as *Isaiah* testifieth, saying, *Now the Lord God and his Spirit hath sent me*, and with the same authority, since the exaltation of our Saviour, sent forth such as were separated to himself, as appeareth in the case of *Barnabas* and
 1 Cor. 12. 11. *Saul*, and giveth all spirituall gifts, dividing to every man
 Rom. 15. 19. *severally as he will*; so that in this kingdome of Christall things are done by the power of the Spirit of God.

Fourthly, He, by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin, was no created Person; for by virtue of that conception he was called the Son of God; whereas if a creature had bin the cause of his conception, he had bin in that respect the son of a creature, nay according to the Adversaries principles, he had taken upon him the nature of Angels. But the Holy Ghost it was by whose operation Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. (For it was an Angel that said, not that an Angel, but that the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.) Therefore the Spirit of God is no created Per-

Luc. 1. 35.

son; which is our second Assertion against the ancient, † This expresse
but newly revived Heresie of the † Arians and Ma- nation of the
cedonians. Spirit of God,
that he was a

Our person, as a mi-
strating Spirit, and created, was acknowledged the doctrine of the Arians, as may
appear out of the former testimonies, and is evident by those which followed his Op-
inions. Which being of two kinds, the Anomeans or pure Arians, such as were Actius,
Eunomius, & Eudoxius, and the Homeousians, or Semiarrians, such as Eusebius, and
Macedonius; they both alike denied the Divinity, and asserted the creation of the Holy
Ghost. The Opinion of the Anomeans is clear out of the words of Eunomius, who ve-
ry subtilly delivered it as if it had bin the opinion of the Ancients, Τὸν Θεὸν ἅγιον ὃν ἀ-
νασφύλαδον τὴν διδασκαλίαν, παρ' ὧν τετὸν αὐτὸ ἀξιώματι καὶ ἰσχύϊ μαδόντας,
ἦν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα πωτιστὸν ἡμῶν. The confessi. of the Ancients was that the Ho-
ly Ghost was the third person of the Trinity in order and dignity, and Eunomius pre-
tending to follow them, added that he was also third in nature, which the Ancients
never taught. And what this third in nature was, he thus declared, Τρίτον τὰ θεῶν καὶ
ῥισί, πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁμογενὲς τῷ υἱῷ ἡμῶν. τρίτη χάρις
τιμωμένη, ὡς πρῶτον καὶ μετὰ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ μόνον τοῦτον τῷ μονοθεῶς πί-
σμα; δευτέρου καὶ δημιουργικῆς διδασκαλίας ἀπολειπόμενον. And again, Εἰ μὴ
πίσμα ὄν, ὡς καὶ ἡννῆμα ἢ ἀννῆμα. ὡς δ' ἀπαρχῇ Θεὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος
ἡννῆμα, λοιπὸν οὐκ ἡννῆμα καὶ πῶμα αὐτὸ ὀνομαζόμενον, apud S.
Basil. advers. Eunom. lib. 3. So Gregory Nyssen repeats the words of the same Euno-
nius, Πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸν Πατέρα αὐτὸν, ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ διὰ τῷ μονο-
θεῶς, and declares that their ordinary language was αὐτὸ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι κτίσ-
μα κτίσμα καὶ ἔργον ἔργου ὀνομαζόμενον, Orat. 1. contra Eunomium. Beside these,
the Semiarrians, and some of those which were Orthodox as to the Divinity of the Son,
were of the same Heresie as to the nature of the Holy Ghost, and therefore were called
Πνευματομάχοι (as Epiphanius derives them in the description of that Heresie, ἀπὸ
ἡμαρτίων καὶ ἀπὸ ὀρθοδόξων) and afterward Macedoniani. Macedoniani sunt
ἡ Μακεδονία Constantinopolitanæ Ecclesiæ Episcopo, quos & Πνευματομά-
χοι Græci dicunt, eo quod de Spiritu S. litigent. Nam de Patre & Filio recte
sentiant, quod unius sit eisdemque substantiæ vel essentiæ, sed de Spiritu S. hoc
volunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes, S. August. Hæres. 52. This Here-
sie was first condemned by the Council of Alexandria, ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι Θεο-
νομήσαντες τῷ ὁμοούσιῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ συναναλαμβάνοντο, Socrat. l. 3. c. 7. After-
ward by the Council held in Illyricum. Ἡμεῖς δ' ὁμοούσιον ὡς καὶ αἱ Συνόδοι, τῷ ἡ
πρῶτῃ Ρώμῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ Γαλιαν, μίαν ἵδ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ὄντι, τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Τῷ
Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι. ὡς τοῖς περὶ τοῦτον, τυτίαν ὡς τοῖς τῷ αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ αὐτός,
Apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 8. The Synod held at Rome with the Gallican
bishops under Damasus. Ὡς τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν μᾶς ὡς αἱ, μᾶς δευτέ-
ρου, μᾶς ἀρετῆς, μᾶς διδασκαλίας, καὶ ὡς χάρις καὶ ἡννῆμα καὶ
πῶμα καὶ ὡς ὡς αἱ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Apud Theodoret. lib. 2.
cap. 22. Another Synod held under the same Damasus at Rome, Εἰ τις εἶποι τὸ
Πνεῦμα

Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ποίημα, ἢ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας, ἀνὰ θεομαίεω, apud Theod. i. 5. c. 10. After and upon these particular Synods this Heresie was fully condemned in the second Generall Council held at Constantinople, in which these words were added to the Nicene Creed, Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον, καὶ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαι διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. And in the first Canon, mentioning the Heresies condemned expressly by the Council; they name ἰδικῶς τὴν τοῦ Εὐνομιανῶν, εἰπω Ἀνομοίων, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἀρειανῶν, εἰπω Εὐδοξίανῶν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἡμεριανῶν, ἢ ἡρώων Πνευματομάχων. And thus the Heresie of Macedonius, who made the Holy Ghost a created Person, was condemned by the second Generall Council, καὶ δὴ οὕτως ὁ ἱεροφάντης χορὸς Μακεδονίου τινος ἡ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ὁρίσας ἅπαντα πάλαι πομπικῶς, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ζωοποιόν ἐκπορεύεται Πνεῦμα, εὐδοξίας ἐδικαίω δυνάμει. ὡς καὶ Ἀρ. καὶ τῷ Τιμ., καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πᾶσι ὁμοῦ Πνεύματος, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ὑπερίαν τὴν δεσποτικὴν καὶ ἱερὰν. καὶ τὸ σὺν τῇ κυριότητι, Photius Epist. i.

Our third Assertion is that which necessarily followeth from the former two, that the Spirit of God, in whose name we are baptized, and in whom we profess to believe, is properly and truly God. For if he be a Person, as we have proved in the declaration of our first Assertion, if he be a Person not created, as we have demonstrated in the corroboration of the second Assertion, then must he of necessity be acknowledged to be God, because there is no uncreated essence beside the essence of the one eternall God. And there is this great felicity in the laying of this third Assertion, that it is not proved onely by the two precedent Assertions, but also by the Adversaries of them both. He which denies the first, that is the Socinian, affirms that the Spirit of God is in God, and is the eternall & omnipotent power of God; he which denies the second, asserts that he is a Person, of an intellectuall nature subsisting; but whatsoever is a Person subsisting of eternall and omnipotent power, must be acknowledged to be God. Whether therefore we look upon the truth of our Assertions, or whether we consider the happinesse of their Negations, the Conclusion is, that the Holy Ghost is God.

But were there nothing, which is already said, demonstrated, there is enough written in the Word of God to assure

are us of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, to make us undoubtingly believe that the Spirit of God is God. It is written by *Moses*, that *when he went in before the Lord to speak with him, he took the vail off, untill he came out.* Exod. 34. 34. And that Lord with whom *Moses* spake was the one *Jehovah*, the God of heaven and earth. But we are assured that the Spirit was and is that Lord to which *Moses* spake; for the Apostle hath taught us so much by his own interpretation, saying, *Even unto this day when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit.* 2 Cor. 3. 17. The Spirit is here so plainly said to be the Lord, that is, *Jehovah* the one Eternall God, that the Adversaries of this truth must either deny that the Lord is here to be taken for God, or, that the Spirit is to be taken for the Spirit of God: either of which denyals must seem very strange to any person which considereth the force and plainnesse of the Apostles discourse. But indeed they are so ready to deny any thing, that they will by no means acknowledge either the one or the other: but *the Lord* must be something which is not God, and *the Spirit* must be something which is not the Spirit of God: and then they conclude the Argument is of no force, and may as well conclude the Apostles Interpretation hath no sense. *The Lord*, they say, is Christ, and not God: for Christ, they say, is not God: *the Spirit*, they say, is the mystery of the Law, or the hidden sense of it, and that every one knows is not the Spirit of God. But we are assured that the Apostle did mean by the spirit the Spirit of God, not the sense of the Law; for he addeth immediately, *Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty*, and the sense of the law is never call'd the Spirit of the Lord. Nay were it not that the coherence of the discourse did satisfie us; yet the objection ought not at all to move us; for the name of Spirit in those places mentioned by them to signify *the sense of the law* hath no affinity with this, according to their

† The places al-
leadged by them
are these, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ
ἐκκλησία, Ro-
man. 2. 29.
ὡς ἐδούλευν
ἡμᾶς ἐν κα-
νὼντι πνεύ-
ματι, καὶ
ἐκκαλιότη-
τι γὰρ μα-
τι, Rom.
7. 6. ἡ τις κα-
λῆται πνευ-
ματικῶς Σό-
δομα καὶ Αἴ-
γυπτον, Rev.
11. 8. One
of these places
speaks onely

adverbially; the other two have Πνεῦμα in obliquo; and one of those two have it cum adjuncto, both of them cum opposito, none of them cum articulo, none of them are in loco subjecti or prædicati; and therefore how any of these can shew, that τὸ Πνεῦμα is this place by us urged, invested with an Article, standing in the place either of a compleat subject or a compleat Predicate, with nothing adjoined, nothing opposed unto it, must be taken in the same sense with them, I cannot imagine. In the first verse of this Chapter indeed it is the subject of a Proposition, and invested with an article; but that is an Article of opposition. Τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ, and this not. Howsoever, in that sense objected it neither agrees with the words before it nor with those which follow it.

* The words in Exodus were these 34. 34. Ἦντα δὲ ἂν οἰσεπορεύετο Μωϋσῆς ἐναντὶ Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, παρεγγήτο τὸ κάλυμμα; which are thus made use of by the Apostle; ἡνίκα δὲ ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Κύριον, περιεργήται τὸ κάλυμμα. Κύριος then is here used by Saint Paul citing some place out of the Old Covenant, and the words which follow, Ὁ δὲ Κύριος signifie the same Κύριος, as appeared by the conjunction καὶ; and if so, then according to the Doctrine of our Adversaries it cannot signifie Christ. For that Lord of whom Moses spake, was then when Moses wrote; but that Christ of which they interpret it, was not then, as they teach, therefore that Lord cannot be Christ, in their interpretation without a contradiction.

these

there 'tis used, framing an Argument and urging it from thence; and if he did not, † that rule is not so universall and infallible, but that *the Lord* in the language of the same Apostle may not signifie the second, but the first or third person of the Trinity. If then *the Lord* be the eternall God, as the Apostle without any question understood him in *Moses*, if *the Spirit* be the Spirit of the Lord, as the Apostle expounds himself in the words immediately following, then the Spirit of the Lord is the eternall God, and so termed in the Scriptures.

For though Christ be most frequently called our Lord, yet be- g God the Father of Christ is our Lord, being o Kúris is often by S. Paul without any restriction or intimation of ap-

propriating that act unto the Son, which is attributed to the Lord by him, the rule cannot be certain and universall. For I desire to know by what means they can be assured, that the Apostle doth by the title o Kúris intend Christ and not the most High God the Father, in these following places, 1 Cor. 3. 5. 4. 19. 7. 10, 12. 16. 7. 1 Thess. 4. 6. 5. 27. 2 Thess. 3. 1, 5, 16. 2 Tim. 1. 16, 18. 2. 7. And beside I ask, how the presence of this generall rule can be properly objected by those who knew that they to whom they doe object this Rule, have contended that this title is elsewhere attributed to the Holy Ghost. As the Author of the book de Spiritu S. under the name of S. Basil, upon that place, 2 Thess. 3. 5. 'Ο ὃς Κύριος κατὰ δυνάμιν ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἐκ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, thus disputes, Τίς ὁ κατὰ δυνάμιν Κύριος ἐκ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκοινωνήσας; ἀποκρινόμενος ἡμῖν οἱ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταδεδωμένοι. Εἴτε γὰρ ὅτι τὸ Πατρὸς ὁ λόγος, πρῶτος αὐτῶν ἔφητο, ὁ ὃς Κύριος ὑμᾶς κατενδύσας ἐκ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας ἀγάπης. ἢ τὸ ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα, προσέκειται αὐτῶν, ἐκ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας. Ζητεῖται οὖν τί ὅτι ἀποκρινόμενος ὁ τῇ προσομοίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου τιμᾶς αἴτιον. And upon the like place, 1 Thess. 3. 12, 13. Ποῖον Κύριον εὐχόμενοι τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἀγαπήσας τὰς καρδίας ἐκ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκοινωνήσας ὡς Θεωλονίχῃ πιστῶν συνέχευε; Ἀποκρινόμενος ἡμῖν οἱ μὲν ὅτι ὡς ἀγαπᾶται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκοινωνίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκοινωνήσας. (the newly-revived opinion clearly) τὸ Πνεῦμα τιθέντες. ἀπ' ἐκ ἐχουσ, De Spiritu Sancto, cap. 21.

Again, the same Scriptures doe clearly manifest the same Spirit to be God, and term him plainly and expressly so. For when Peter said, Ananias, *Why hast Satan filled thine heart to lye to the Holy Ghost?* he repeateth the same question in reference to the same offence, *Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.* To lye unto the Holy Ghost, is to lye unto God: to lye unto the Holy Ghost, is not to

Act. 5. 3, 4.

† Ex his facile
apparet haud-
quaquam ex eo
loco concludi
posse Spiritum
S. esse Deum,
cum alio modo
de Spiritu S. lo-
quatur Petrus,
alio de Deo.
Illic dicit men-
tiri seu fallere,
ac iudificari
Spiritum S. hic
mentiiri Deo,
Crellius de
uno Deo Patre,
l. 1. sect. 3.
Argum. 1.

lye unto men, because the Holy Ghost is not man, and consequently not to lye unto any Angel, because the Holy Ghost is not an Angell, not to lye unto any creature, because the Holy Ghost is no creature, but to lye unto God, because the Holy Ghost is God. To this plain and evident Argument there are so many Answers, that the very multitude discovers the weaknesse of them all: for if any one of them were sufficient to bear down the force of our reason, the rest would be superfluous. First, they answer that it cannot be collected from hence that the Spirit is God, because the *Holy Ghost* in the Originall is † put in one case, and *God* in another, and the Apostle speaking in one manner of the Spirit, and in another of God, cannot shew that the Spirit is God. To which it is easily answered, that the case or manner of the Apostles speech can make no difference, if the sense and substance be the same, as here it is; for to deceive the Holy Ghost is nothing else but to lye unto him, or by a lye to endeavour to deceive him. The Act objected to *Ananias* was but one, which act of his the Apostles look'd upon as injurious not to themselves but to the Holy Ghost; and therefore *Peter* shew'd the sin to be not against men but against God; as certainly then as the Apostles were men, so certainly was the Holy Ghost, in the esteem of *Peter*, God. As for that sense which they put upon the words, different from that of lying to God, as if *Ananias* were accused for counterfeiting the Holy Ghost, it is most certain that the words can in this place bear no such sense; for the sin of *Ananias* is again expressed in the case of his wife *Sapphira*, to whom *Peter* said, *How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?* but to tempt the Spirit, and to counterfeit the Spirit, are two severall things. And it is evident that in this place the tempting of the Spirit, was nothing else but lying to him. For *Peter* said to *Sapphira*, *Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much; And she said, Yea, for so much. In which answer she lyed. Then Peter said unto her,*

How

How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Here is no colour then for that new pretence, that *Ananias* did bear the Apostles in hand that what was done he did by the motion of the Holy Spirit, and so did pretend, counterfeit and bely the Holy Ghost. This is not to expound *S. Peter*, but to bely *Ananias*, and make him guilty of that sin which he was never yet accused of. It is most certain that he lyed, it is also certain that he to whom he lyed was the Holy Ghost, and therefore it might be well † translated that he lyed to the Holy Ghost. Next because they may very well be conscious that this verball or phraseologicall answer may not seem sufficient, they tell us though both the phrases were synonymous, yet they did no way prove that the Spirit is God: and the reason, which they render to justifie this negation, is, because there are severall places of the Scripture, in which the messengers of God, who are acknowledged not to be God, are mentioned in the same relation unto God, as here the Spirit is. To which the answer is most plain and clear, that there is no creature ever mentioned in the same manner as the Holy Ghost is here. As when they alledge those words of the Apostle, *He therefore that despiseth*,

† Our Translation is here accused without reason. For though the Original be *ὁ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, yet some Copies have it *ὁς τὸ πνεῦμα*, and the Syriack did so read and interpret it

מִתְנַחֵם בְּרוּחַ הַקּוֹדֶשׁ, the Vulgar Latine to the same purpose, *mentiri te Spiritui S. And the Author of the Tractat de temp. Barbarico*, under the name of *S. Austin*, *mentiri te apud Spiritum S. cap. 3.* *Non ψεύσας οὐδὲ πνεῦμα* is the same with *τὸ πνεῦμα*, as *Μὴ ψεύσας οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπου*, Lye not one to another. If we read it *ὁς πνεῦμα* then, it is rightly translated. Again, if we read it *τὸ πνεῦμα*, it has in this case the sense of *τὸ πνεῦμα*. As *Psal. 66. 2.* *יְהוָה יִכְחַשׁ לָךְ אֱלֹהִים*, LXX. *ψεύσας οὐ οὐχ ἔσθαι* *ὁ*, of the same sense with that *Psal. 18. 61.* *יְהוָה יִכְחַשׁ לָךְ*, LXX. *Οὐχ ἔσθαι* *ὁ* *ψεύσας* *τὸ* *πνεῦμα*. So *Deutero. 33. 26.* *יְהוָה יִכְחַשׁ לָךְ*, LXX. *Καὶ ψεύσας οὐ οὐχ ἔσθαι* *ὁ*. And *Isa. 57. 11.* *יְהוָה יִכְחַשׁ לָךְ*, *ὁ* *ψεύσας*; *2 King. 4. 16.* *אֵלֶּיךָ הָכֹחַ בְּשֹׁפְחָה*, *μὴ διαψεύσῃ* *τὸ* *πνεῦμα*. If therefore we read it *ψεύσας τὸ πνεῦμα*, it is rightly translated to lye unto the Ho'y Ghost; and so agreeth with that which followeth to tempt the Holy Ghost, as *Psal. 78. 36.* *τὴ γλώσσῃ αὐτῶν ἐψεύσαντο*, and verse 41. *ἐπείσταν ὁ ἐπείσας τὸν Θεόν*. Therefore what never before are layd upon the phrase, or difference of expression, are either false or frivolous.

1 Thess. 4. 8.

Mat. 10. 40.

Luc. 10. 16.

despiseth not man but God, who hath also given us his Holy Spirit: I cannot see what similitude can be made unto the Scripture now in question: for if the Spirit be not understood in the first words, *he therefore that despiseth*, it hath no relation to the present question; & if it be, it were so far from being a confutation, that it would be another confirmation. As for the other, *He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*; it is so far from justifying their interpretation, that it hath nothing in it like that which founds our reason, that is, no opposition. For there are three particulars in that Scripture which we produce for our Assertion; first, that they lyed to the Holy Ghost; secondly, that, in doing so, they lyed not unto men; and thirdly, that by the same act they lyed unto God. In which the opposition is our foundation. For if the Spirit of God were not God, as we are sure it is not man; it might as well have bin said, you lyed not unto the Holy Ghost, but unto God. And indeed if the Apostles would have aggravated the sin of *Ananias* with the full propriety and iniquity, in their sense, he must have said, thou hast not lyed unto men, nor unto the Spirit of God, but unto God. But being he first told him plainly his sin, *lying to the Holy Ghost*, and then let him know the sinfulness of it, *thou hast not lyed unto men, but unto God*: it is evident that the Holy Ghost to whom he lyed is God.

Thirdly, that Person whose inhabitation maketh a temple, is God: for if the notion of a temple be nothing else but to be the house of God, it to be the house of any creature is not to be a temple, as it is not, then no inhabitation of any created person can make a Temple. But the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost maketh a temple, as we are informed by the Apostle, *What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?* Therefore the Holy Ghost is God. To this is replied differently

1 Cor. 6. 19.

according to the diversity of our Adversaries; as it is not probable that the deniers of so great a truth should agree. The first tells us that if we would enforce by this reason, that the Holy Ghost is God, we must † prove that he is a person, and that he doth possess our bodies by a divine right. But we have already proved that he is a person, and certainly there can be no other right but that which belongs to God, by which the Holy Ghost inhabiteth and possesseth us. Nor have they any pretence to evince the contrary but that which more confirmeth our Assertion; for they urge onely those words of the Apostle, *a Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.* We doe certainly know that we are the temple of God; and we also know that the Spirit of God dwelleth therefore in us; and we therefore know that we are the temple of God, because we know that the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; and we know no other reason why we are the temple of God, when the Spirit of God dwelleth in us, but onely because we know the Spirit of God is God; for if the Spirit were any other Person not divine, or any thing but a Person though divine, we could not by any means be assured that he did properly inhabit in us, or if he did, that by his inhabitation he could make a temple of us. The second hath very little to say, but onely this, that being the Holy Ghost who possesseth us, is a Person, we must shew that our bodies are his by the highest interest, and primarily dedicated to his honour: which he therefore conceives we cannot shew, because he thinks our body is not at all his by interest, or dedicated to his honour. But it were very strange, if we should be baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost should have no interest in us, but that he should be ours by interest, and not we his; that the Spirit of God should call for men to be separated to himself, and that they which are so separated should be no way dedicated to his honour. If the Holy Ghost had no interest in us, be-

cause

† Si quis ex eo quod corpus nostrum Spiritus S. templū sit, concludere velit eum esse Deum, illi demonstrandum est ita corpus nostrum Spiritus S. templum dici, ut intelligatur eum esse personam cujus honori corpus nostrum sit dedicatum, a qua corpus nostrum eo jure quod divini numinis proprium est, possideatur, & principaliter incolatur, Celsus de uno Deo Patre, lib. 1. Sect. 3. a 1 Cor. 3. 16.

cause he is given unto us, then Christ can have no interest in us, for he is also given unto us. Indeed if the Apostle had said, as our Adversary doth, that *we ought with our body to glorifie, not the Spirit. but God*, I should have concluded that the Spirit is not God; but being that blessed Spirit which dwelleth in us, and spake by the Apostles, never taught us not to glorifie him, I shall rather take leave to suspect that of blasphemy, then the Assertion of his Deity to be fallie Divinity. And whereas it is said, that *the Apostle hath hinted in what respect our body is the temple of the holy Spirit, to wit, by inhabitation*; this is so far from breeding in me the least thought of diminution, that by this onely notion I am fully confirmed in the belief of my Assertion. For I know no other way by which God peculiarly inhabiteth in us but by the inhabitation of the spirit: I understand no other way by which we can be the temple of God but by the inhabitation of God, as it is written, *Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people*: And therefore I conclude that the Holy Ghost who by his inhabitation maketh our bodies temples, is that God which dwelleth in us.

2 Cor. 6. 16.

Fourthly, He, to whom the divine attributes doe belong as certainly as they belong unto God the Father, is truly and properly God; because those are divine attributes which are proprieties of the divine nature, and consequently none can be indued with them to whom the nature of God belongeth not. But the divine attributes, such as are Omniscience, Omnipotency, Omnipresence, and the like, do belong as certainly unto the Holy Ghost as they doe unto God the Father. Therefore we are as much assured that the Holy Ghost is God. The Scriptures to prove these attributes are so well known, that I shall not need to mention them, and they are so many that to manage them against the exceptions of the Adversaries

aries would take up too much room in this discourse: especially considering they question some of them in the Father as well as in the Spirit, and so I should be forced to a double proof.

Fifthly, He, to whom are attributed those works which are proper unto God, by and for which God doth require of us to acknowledge and worship him as God, is properly and truly God: because the operations of all things flow from that essence by which they are, and therefore if the operations be truly divine, that is, such as can be produced by no other but God, then must the essence of that person which produceth them be truly such. But such works as are proper unto God, by and for which God hath required us to acknowledge him and worship him as God, are attributed often in the Scriptures to the Spirit of God, as the acts of Creation and Conservation of all things, the miracles wrought upon and by our blessed Saviour, the works of grace and power wrought in the hearts of true believers, and the like. Therefore without any further disputation, which cannot be both long and proper for an Exposition, I conclude my third Assertion, that the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of God, is a Person truly and properly divine, the true and living God.

Now being we doe firmly believe that the true and living God can be but one, that the infinity of the divine essence is incapable of multiplicity, being we have already shewn that the Father is originally that one God, which is denied by none; and have also proved that the only Son is the same God, receiving by an eternall generation the same divine nature from the Father; it will also be necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Spirit of God, to shew how that blessed Spirit is God: to which purpose, that I may proceed methodically, my fourth Assertion is, that the Spirit of God, which is the true and living God, is neither God the Father, nor the Son of

M m m m

God.

Joh. 15. 26.

First, though the Father be undoubtedly God, though the Holy Ghost be also God, and (because there cannot be two Gods,) the same God; yet the Holy Ghost is not the Father. For the Scriptures doe as certainly distinguish them in their persons, as they doe unite them in their nature. He which proceedeth from the Father is not the Father, because it is impossible any person should proceed from himself; but the Holy Ghost *proceedeth from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father. He which is sent by the Father and from the Father, is not the Father, by whom and from whom he is sent; for no person can be sent by himself, and by another from himself. But the Holy Ghost is sent by God the Father, and by the Son *from the Father*; therefore he is not the Father.

Joh. 16. 19.

Secondly, though we have formerly proved that the Son of God is properly and truly God, though we now have also proved that the Spirit of God is God; and in reference to both we understand the same God: yet the Holy Ghost is not the Son. For he which receiveth of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorifieth the Son, cannot be the Son, because no person can be said to receive from himself that which is his own, and to glorifie himself by so receiving. But the Comforter, *who is the Holy Ghost*, received of that which is the Son's, and by receiving of it glorified the Son; for so our Saviour expressly said, *He shall glorifie me, for he shall receive of mine*. Therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son. Again, He whose coming depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure, cannot be the Son who therefore departed that he might send him. But the coming of the Holy Ghost depended upon the Son's departing, and his sending after his departure: as he told the Apostles before he departed, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I goe away; for if I goe not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you*: therefore the Holy Ghost is not the Son.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, though the Father be God, and the Son be God, and the Holy Ghost be also the same God, yet we are assured that the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son; because the Scriptures frequently represent him as distinguished both from the Father and the Son. As when *the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and loe, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*, he was manifestly distinguished from the person of the Son, upon whom he lighted, and from the person of the Father, who spake from heaven of his Son. The Apostle teacheth us that *through the Son we have an access by one Spirit unto the Father*, and consequently assureth us that the Spirit, *by whom*, is not the Father, *to whom*, nor the Son, *through whom*, we have that access. So God sent forth his Son, that we might receive the adoption of sons: and because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son, into our hearts, crying, *Abba, Father*. Where the Son is distinguished from the Father as first sent by him, and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father and the Son, as sent by the Father after he had sent the Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us severall times in a word, as, *The Comforter whom the Father will send in my name; the Comforter, whom I will send unto you from the Father*, and when that Comforter is come, *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. I conclude therefore against the old *† Sabellian* Heresie, that the Holy Ghost, although he be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father nor God the Son; which is my fourth Assertion.

Mat. 3. 16.

Eph. 2. 18.

Joh. 14. 26.

15. 26.

Mat. 28. 19.

† This Heresie indeed was very ancient, even before Sabellius, though those which held it were after.

Our

words all so denominated from Sabellius. For we find it was the opinion of Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote, who being urged with that place where the three persons were distinguished, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, the power of the highest shall overshadow thee*, Therefore that which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God, answered thus, *Filius Dei Deus est, & virtus altissimi altissimus est*. After Praxeas followed Noctus, *μὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅτι ἡ δύναμις, ὡς ὁ υἱος τοῦ Πατρὸς*.

M m m m 2

μ m

μα ἡ γὰρ ἀποφ. Epiph. Hær. 77. Noetiani à quodam Noëto, qui docebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem & Spiritum S. S. Aug. Hær. 36. Suddenly insinuat Noëtus arose Sabellius. Δογματίζετο δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἅπλως καὶ τὸν Sabellianum, τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν Πατρί, τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν Υἱῷ, τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, αἱ δὲ τρεῖς οὐκ ἦσαν ὁμοουσιότητες, Epiph. Hær. 62. From him afterwards were all which held the same opinion call'd Sabellians. Sabelliani ab illo Noëto quem supra memoravimus defluxisse dicuntur. Nam & discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed qua causa duas hereses Epiphanius computet nescio, cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, & ideo ex illo celebrius hæc heresis nomen acceperit. Noetian. enim difficultime ab aliquo sciuntur, Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum, S. Aug. Hær. 41.

Our fifth Assertion is, that the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the blessed Trinity. For being he is a Person, by our first Assertion; a Person not created, by the second, but a divine Person, properly and truly God, by the third; being though he is thus truly God, he is neither the Father nor the Son, by the fourth Assertion, it followeth that he is one of the three; and of the three he is the third. For as there is a number in the Trinity, by which the Persons are neither more nor less than three, so there is also an order by which, of these Persons the Father is the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third. Nor is this order arbitrary or externall, but internall and necessary, by virtue of a subordination of the second unto the first, and of the third unto the first and second. The Godhead was communicated from the Father to the Son, not from the Son unto the Father; though therefore this were done from all eternity, and so there can be no priority of time, yet there must be acknowledged a priority of Order, by which the Father not the Son is first, and the Son not the Father second. Again, the same Godhead was communicated by the Father and the Son unto the Holy Ghost, not by the Holy Ghost to the Father or the Son: though therefore this was also done from all Eternity, and therefore can admit of no priority in reference to time; yet that of order must be here observed; so that the Spirit receiving the Godhead from the Father who is the

the first Person cannot be the first, receiving the same from the Son who is the second, cannot be the second; but being from the first and second must be of the three the third. And thus both the number and the order of the Persons are signified together by the Apostle saying, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.* 1 Joh. 5. 7. And though they are not expressly said to be three, yet the same number is sufficiently declared, and the same order is expressly mentioned, in the baptismal Institution made *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* As therefore we have formerly proved the Son to be truly the second Person, and at the same time the Father to be the first, so doth this which we have, but briefly, spoken, prove that the Holy Ghost is the third; which is our fifth Assertion.

Our sixth and last Assertion, sufficient to manifest the nature of the Holy Ghost, as he is the Spirit of God, teacheth that Spirit to be a Person proceeding from the Father, and the Son. From whence at last we have a clear description of the blessed Spirit, that he is the most high and eternal God, of the same nature attributes and operations with the Father, and the Son, as receiving the same essence from the Father and the Son, by proceeding from them both. Now this procession of the Spirit in reference to the Father is delivered expressly, in relation to the Son is contained virtually in the Scriptures. First, it is expressly said that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father, as our Saviour testifieth, *When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And this is also evident from what hath bin already asserted: for being the Father and the Spirit are the same God, and being so the same in the unity of the nature of God, are yet distinct in their personality, one of them must have the same nature from the other, and because the Fa-

Marth, 10. 20.

1 Co. 2. 11, 12.

Galat, 4. 6.

Rom. 8. 9.

1 Pet. 1. 11.

Phil, 1. 19.

Joh. 14. 26.

ther hath bin already shewn to have it from none, it followeth that the Spirit hath it from him. Secondly, though it be not expressly spoken in the Scripture that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, yet the substance of the same truth is virtually contained there; because those very expressions which are spoken of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father, for that reason because he proceedeth from the Father, are also spoken of the same Spirit in relation to the Son, and therefore there must be the same reason presupposed in reference to the Son, which is expressed in reference to the Father. Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Father. *It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* For by the language of the Apostle the Spirit of God is the Spirit which is of God, saying, *The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. And we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.* Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son. For *because we are somes God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts.* The Spirit of Christ. *Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his:* even the Spirit of Christ which was in the Prophets. The Spirit of Jesus Christ, as the Apostle speaks, *I know that this shall turn to my salvation through my prayer and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ.* If then the Holy Spirit be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceeded from the Father, it followeth, that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son. Again, because the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father he is therefore sent by the Father, as having by the originall communication a right of mission; as, *the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send.* But the same Spirit which is sent by the Father, is also sent by the Son, as he saith, *when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you.* Therefore the Son hath the same right

mission with the Father, and consequently must be acknowledged to have communicated the same essence. The Father is never sent by the Son because he received not the Godhead from him, but the Father sendeth the Son, because he communicated the Godhead to him: in the same manner neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Spirit because neither of them received the divine nature from the Spirit: but both the Father and the Son sendeth the Holy Ghost, because the divine nature common to both the Father and the Son was communicated by them both to the Holy Ghost. As therefore the Scriptures declare expressly that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, so doe they also virtually teach that he proceedeth from the Son.

From whence it came to passe in the Primitive times that the *Latine* Fathers taught expressly the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, because by good consequence they did collect so much from those passages of the Scripture which we have us'd to prove that truth.

† This is not the late but ancient opinion of the Latine Church, as will appear by these testimonies,

Loqui de eo (Sp.S.) non necesse est, quia de Patre & Filio auctoribus confitendus est, S. Hilar. de Trinit. l. 2. Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit à Patre & Filio, non separatur à Patre, non separatur à Filio, S. Ambros. de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 10. Spiritus autem Sanctus vere Spiritus est procedens quidem à Patre & Filio: sed non est ipse Filius, quia non generatur, neque Pater, quia procedit ab utroque, Id. de Sym. c. 3. Et in servos cœlestia dona profudit, Spiritum ab Unigena Sanctum & Patre procedentem, Paulinus in Nat. 9. S. Felicit. Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus S. & à Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra Spiritus & Patris & Filii Spiritus dicitur, S. August. de Trinit. lib. 4. Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites, eundem Spiritum. S. qui Patris & Filii unus est Spiritus, de Patre & Filio procedere, Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum. Qui noster Dominus, qui tuus unicus Spiritus de patris corde Paraclitum. Prud. Hymn. 5. Cathem. Tanquam idem Deus nunc Pater, nunc Filius, nunc Spiritus S. nominetur, nec alius est qui genuit; alius qui genitus est, alius qui de utroque processit. Leo speaking of the Sabellian Heresie, Epist. 93. c. 19. t. Audi manifestius proprium Patris esse genuisse, & proprium Filii nunc fuisse: proprium vero Sp. S. procedere de Patre Filioque; Vigilantius contra Eun. l. 1. B; which testimonies and the like of the Latine Fathers we may well guesse in which Church the Creed commonly attributed to Athanasius first was framed; for as it is concluded to be written first in Latine, so it is most probable that it was composed by some member of the Latine Church, by that expression in it, Spiritus S. à Patre & Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens.

And

And the **Greek Fathers**, though they stuck more closely to the phrase and language of the Scripture, saying that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and † not saying, that he proceedeth from the Son; yet they acknowledged under another Scripture expression the same thing which the *Latines* understand by procession, viz. that the Spirit is of or from the Son, as he is of and from the Father, and therefore usually when they said he *proceedeth from the Father*, they * also added, he *received of the Son*. The interpretation of which words according to the *Latines* inferred a * procession, and that which the *Greeks* did understand thereby, was the same which the *Latines* meant by the procession from the Son, that is the receiving of his essence from him. That as the Son is God of God by being of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is God of God by

† The Ancient
Greek Fathers
speaking of this
procession, *men-
tion the
Father onely,*
and never, I
think, expresse
the Son, as
sticking con-
stantly in this

to the language of the Scriptures. Thus Gregory Nazianzene distinguishes the three Persons, *Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὁμοῦ ὄντι ἰσότητι, ἰσότητι τῷ ἀγέννητῳ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ ἀγέννητῳ, καὶ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενῳ*, Orat. de Filio. And the three proprieties attributed to the three Persons are these, *ἀγέννητος* to the Father; *ἀγεννητός* to the Son, and *ἐκπορεύων* to the Holy Ghost. But this word *ἐκπορεύων*, or the verb *ἐκπορεύω*, was not used by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but only, as the Scriptures speak, in relation to the Father.

[illegible]

ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ἀπορρίψασθαι Πιστεύομεν ὅτι τὸ Κύριον λέγοντι, τὸ Πνεῦμα ὃ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ τὸ θεοτάτω ὅτι Παύλῳ ὁμοίως φάσκοντι. ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ὃ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, S. Cyril in his reply takes no great notice of this high charge of impiety and blasphemy, and onely answers to the Argument so far as it concerned his expression, viz. that the Spirit is ἰδιον τοῦ Τριῦ Πνεύματος, but in this Answer makes use of that Scripture which he and others used to prove that the Spirit had his essence from the Son. Ἐκπορεύεθ' ἡμεῖς ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τὸ τῷ Σωτῆρι φωνῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ ἀγιοτήτος ἐστὶ τὸ Τριῦ. πάντα ὃ ἔχει μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς. καὶ τὸ αὐτὸς ἐδίδαξεν ἐν πᾶσι τὰ ἅγια Πνεύματι. πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ Πατὴρ ἐμεῖς ὅτι. διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν ὁμῶν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγεῖ ὑμῖν. Although therefore S. Cyril doth not goe to maintain that which Theodoret denied, and S. Cyril elsewhere teaches, viz. that the Holy Ghost is from the Son, yet he justified his own position by that Scripture which by himself and the rest of the Fathers is thought to teach as much.

* The second
Generall Council
held at Con-
stantinople,

finding it necessary to make an addition to the Nicene Creed in the Article concerning the Ho'y Ghost, of which that Council had said no more this, I believe in the Holy Ghost, framed this accession against Macedonius, εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον; in which they spake most warily, using the words of the Scripture, and the language of the Church, which was so known and publick, that it is recorded even by Lucian, in his Dialogue call'd Philopatris, Κεῖ. Καὶ τίνα ἐπομέσονται; Τετ. Ὑψιμέδοντα Θεόν, μέγαν, ἀμείβοντα, ἁγνίστα, ὃν Πατὴρ, πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐν ἐκτεῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἐνός τεῖα. Ταῦτα νόμιζε Ζήνα, Ἰβνὸς ἡγεῖ Θεόν. This Creed being received by the whole Church of God, and it being added also by the next Generall Council at Ephesus, that it should not be lawfull to make any addition to it. Notwithstanding, the Question being agitated in the West, Utrum Spiritus S. sicut procedit à Patre, ita & procedat à Filio, and it being concluded in the affirmative, they did not onely declare the doctrine to be true, but also added the same to the Constantinopolitan Creed, and sang it publicly in their Liturgy. Credimus & in Spiritum S. Dominum & vivificantem, ex Patre Filioque procedentem. This being first done in the Spanish and French churches, and the matter being referred to Leo the third.

third Bishop of Rome, he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated. For in the Act of the Synod held at Aquigranum we find it so determined by the Pope upon the conference with the Legates. Ergo, ut video, illud à vestra Paternitate decernitur, ut primo illud de quo quaestio agitur, de saepe facto Symbolo tollatur, & tunc demum à quolibet licite ac libere sive cantando, sive tradendo discatur & doceat. So one of the Legates: to which Leo answered thus, Ita proculdubio à nostra parte decernitur: ita quoque ut à vestra assentiatur, à nobis omnibus modis suaderetur. Beside, lest the Roman Church might be accused to join with the Spanish and French Churches in this addition, the same Pope caused the Creed to be publicly set forth in the Church graven in silver plates, one in Latine, and another in Greek, in the same words which the Council of Constantinople had first sent it. Hic pro amore & cautela orthodoxæ Fidei fecit in B. Petri Basilica seu argentea duo scripta utraque Symbolo, unum quidem literis Græcis, & alium Latinis, sedentia dextra lævaque super ingressum Corporis. Anastasius in vita Leonis III. Leo tertius (Symboli) transcriptum in tabula argentea, post altare B. Pauli posita posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait, & cautela Fidei Orthodoxæ. In quo quidem Symbolo in processione Spiritus S. solus commemoratur Pater his verbis, Et in Spiritum S. Dominum vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre & Filio coadorandum, & glorificandum, P. Lombardus. These were taken out of the Archiva at Rome, saith Photius, and so placed by Leo, that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true Copies of that Creed not to be altered. Ο Θεωσις ὁ Λέων καὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς Θεωσις φυλακίαις ἡς κορυφαίων Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου ἐκ παλαιότατων χρόνων ἀποτεθωσις μὲν τῶν ἱερῶν κεκηγμένων δύο ἀσπίδας, ἀρχαῖα καὶ ῥήματα ἐλλωικοῖς ἐλεγον τὴν ἱερὰν τὴν ἡμῶν πίστεως ἐκδοσιν, ταύτας καταναγνώσκειν κατενόουν τῷ Ῥωμαῖ καὶ πλήθους καὶ εἰς ὅσον ἀπαύτων ἐλθὼν ἐδικρίνωσι, καὶ πολλοὶ ἡς διασπορῶν τῶν καὶ ἀναγνώκτων ἐπὶ τῷ βίῳ ὁμολοῦσι, Photius apud Nicetam Theol. Orthod. Fid. t. 21. ut exscripti Archiep. Armachanus. Οὗτος ὁ Λέων καὶ τὸ Θεωσις φυλακίον τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ῥωμαίων ἀσπίδας ἀσπίδας δύο τῶν ἱερῶν κεκηγμένων ἀποτεθωσις μὲν τῶν ἱερῶν ἐλλωικοῖς καὶ γράμματα καὶ ῥήματα ἐχέσας τὴν εὐσεβῆ τῆς πίστεως ἐκδοσιν, Idem apud Euthymium, Panopl. Dom. tit. 12. ab eodem Archiep. exscriptus. This was the great and prudent care of Leo the third, that there should be no addition made to the ancient Creed authorized by a Generall Council, and received by the whole Church; and by this means he quieted all distempers for his time. But not long after, the following Paper, more in love with their own Authority, then desirous of the peace and Unity of the Church, neglected the tables of Leo, and admitted the addition Filioque. This was done first in the time and by the power of Pope Nicolaus the first, who by the activity of Photius was condemned for it. Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit (Photius) ipsum (Nicolaum) fore excommunicatum quod apposuerat ad Symbolum Spiritum S. à Filio procedere. Similiter & depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam tertii Concilii, Antonin. Part 3. tit. 22. c. 13. This was it which Photius complained of so highly in his Encyclick Epistle to the Archbishop of the Eastern Church. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐχ' μόνον εἰς ταύτας παρενομεῖν ἐξηνέχθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς κακῶν ἐστὶ κερωνὶς εἰς ταύτας ἀνέδεγαν, πρὸς γὰρ τοῖς εἰρημαίοις ἀποτήμασι καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἅγιον σύμβολον ὁ

πᾶσι τοῖς Ὀικουμενικοῖς καὶ οἰκουμένη τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχει πῶς ἴδον, νόμοις
 λογισμοῖς καὶ παρὰ γράμματι λόγοις καὶ ὁράσει ὑποβόλῃ καὶ δεικνύειν ἐπεχειροῦται
 (ὡς καὶ τῷ πονηρῷ μηχανημάτων) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ ἐκ τῷ Πατρὶ μόνον,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῷ Υἱῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι κηρύττοντες, Phot. *Epi.* 2. §. 8. Hugo
 Etherianus legit κηρύττοντες, αὐτὸν venit, frustra proficitur; Thus far Photius
 against Nicolaus before he was deposed. After he was restored again, in the time of
 Pope John the eighth in the eighth General Council, as the Greeks call it, it was de-
 clared that the Addition of Filioque made in the Creed should be taken away. Ἐξή-
 σαν ὃ ἡ Σύνοδος αὐτὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Συμβόλου, καὶ ἔκρινεν ἄξιον ἵνα
 ἐξαίρεθῇ παντὶ ὥς, says Marcus Bishop of Ephesus in the Council of Florence. After
 this the same complaint was continued by Michael Cerularius, and Theophylact, in
 as high a manner as by Photius, Ἐστὶν οὖν τὸ μῆριον ἐκείνο σφάλμα, καὶ τὸτο ὃ τὸ
 τῷ Σολομῶντι ἄδεν πατρίως ποιοῦν Ὀικουμενικῶν, ἡ ἐν τῷ τῆς πίστεως Συμβόλου
 κηρυγμῶν, ἣν ἐποίησαντο ἀνακηρύττοντες τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ ἐκ τῷ
 Υἱῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι, Theophylactus ad Joan. cap. 3. Καὶ τοῖς Δυτικοῖς τείνω ἄλλοι
 καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ δόγμα διαμῆναι τὴν πατρικὴν πίσιν σθεῦον, ὅς δὲ τὸ ἐν τῷ Συμβό-
 λῳ ἐπὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι περιτέλειον, ἔνθα ὁ κίνδυνος μῆρις, τὸτο μὴ
 διορθώσας ἀξέμενον ὁ συγχωρῶν ἀσχερεν, Ibid. Thus did the Oriental
 Church accuse the Occidental for adding Filioque to the Creed, contrary to a General
 Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the
 Authority of another Council; and so the Schism between the Latine and the Greek
 Church began and was continued, never to be ended untill those words, καὶ ἐκ τῷ Υἱῷ,
 or Filioque, are taken out of the Creed. The one relying upon the truth of the do-
 ctine contained in those words, and the Authority of the Pope to alter any thing; the
 other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for
 the authority of the ancient Councils. This therefore is much to be lamented, that the
 Greeks should not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their
 Ancestors, in the substance of it; and that the Latines should force the
 Greeks to make an addition to the Creed, without as great an authority
 as hath prohibited it, and to use that language in the expression of this
 doctrine which never was used by any of the Greek Fathers.

and refusing to rase it out of the Creed again, it be-
 came an occasion of the vast Schism between the Eastern
 and the Western Churches.

Now although the addition of words to the formall
 Creed without the consent, and against the protestation, of
 the Oriental Church be not justifiable, yet that which
 was added is nevertheless a certain truth, and may be so
 used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a
 truth, so long as they pretend it not to be a Definition of
 that Council, but an addition or explication inserted, and

condemn not those who, out of a greater respect to such Synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions, nor speak any other language then the Scriptures and their Fathers spake. Howsoever we have sufficiently in our Assertions declared the nature of the Holy Ghost, distinguishing him from all qualities, energies or operations, in that he is truly and properly a Person; differencing him from all creatures and finite things, as he is not a created Person; shewing him to be of an infinite and eternall essence, as he is truly and properly God; distinguishing him from the Father and the Son, as being not the Father, though the same God with the Father, not the Son, though the same God with him; demonstrating his order in the blessed Trinity, as being not the first or second, but the third Person, and therefore the third, because as the Son receiveth his essence communicated to him by the Father, and is therefore second to the Father, so the Holy Ghost receiveth the same essence communicated to him by the Father and the Son, and so proceedeth from them both, and is truly and properly the Spirit of the Father, and as truly and properly the Spirit of the Son.

Thus far have we declared the Nature of the Holy Ghost, what he is in himself, as the *Spirit* of God; it remaineth that we declare what is the Office of the same, what he is unto us, as the *Holy Spirit*. For although the Spirit of God be of infinite essentiall & originall holinesse, as God, and so may be called *Holy* in himself, though other Spirits which are created, be either actually unholy, or of defectible sanctity, and so having the name of Spirit common unto them, he may be termed *Holy*, that he may be distinguished from them: yet I conceive he is rather called the Holy Spirit, or the *Spirit of holinesse*, because, of the three Persons in the blessed Trinity, it is his particular Office to sanctifie, or make us holy. Rom. I. 4.

Now when I speak of the Office of the Holy Ghost, I do not understand any Ministeriall office or function, such

Heb. 1. 14.

Joh. 3. 16.
Ephel. 2. 18.

as that of the created Angels is, who are *all ministering Spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of Salvation*; for I have already proved this Spirit to be a Person properly divine, and consequently above all ministration. But I intend thereby whatsoever it attributed unto him peculiarly in the salvation of man, as the work wrought by him, for which he is sent by the Father and the Son. For all the Persons in the Godhead are represented unto us as concurring unto our Salvation: *God so loved the world that he gave his onely begotten Son, and through that Son we have an acesse by one Spirit unto the Father.* As therefore what our Saviour did and suffered for us belonged to that Office of a Redeemer which he took upon him: so whatsoever the Holy Ghost worketh in order to the same salvation, we look upon as belonging to his office. And because without holinesse it is impossible to please God, because we are all impure, and unholy, and the purity and holinesse which is required in us to appear in the presence of God whose eyes are pure, must be wrought in us by the Spirit of God, who is called Holy because he is the cause of this holinesse in us, therefore we acknowledge the Office of the Spirit of God to consist in the sanctifying of the servants of God, and the declaration of this Office, added to the description of his nature, to be a sufficient explication of the object of faith contained in this Article *I believe in the Holy Ghost.*

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.

Now this Sanctification being opposed to our impurity and corruption, and answering fully to the latitude of it, whatsoever is wanting in our nature of that holinesse and perfection must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore being by nature we are totally voyd of all saving truth, and under an impossibility of knowing the will of God; being as *no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him, even so none knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God*; this Spirit *searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God, and revealeth*

revealeth them unto the Sons of men; so that thereby the
 darknesse of their understanding is expell'd, and they are
 enlightned with the knowledge of their God. This work
 of the Spirit is double, either externall and generall, or
 internall and particular. The externall and generall work
 of the Spirit, as to the whole Church of God, is the Re-
 velation of the will of God, by which so much in all ages
 hath bin propounded as was sufficient to instruct men unto
 eternall life. For there have bin *holy Prophets ever since* Luc. 1. 70.
the world began; and prophecie came not at any time by the 2 Pet. 1. 21.
will of man, but Holy men of God spake as they were mo-
ved by the Holy Ghost. When it pleased God *in the last* Heb. 1. 2.
dayes to speak unto us by his Son, even that Son sent his
 Spirit into the Apostles, the *Spirit of truth*, that he might Joh. 16. 13.
guide them into all truth, teaching them all things, and
bringing all things to their remembrance whatsoever
Christ had said unto them. By this means it came to pass
 that *all Scripture was given by inspiration of God*, that is
 by the motion and operation of the Spirit of God; and
 so whatsoever is necessary for us to know and believe, was
 delivered by Revelation. Again, the same Spirit which
 revealeth the Object of Faith generally to the Universall
 Church of God, which object is propounded externally by
 the Church to every particular believer, doth also illumi-
 nate the understandings of such as believe that they may
 receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God not onely in
 the object but also in the act; Christ is not onely given
 unto us, in whom we believe, but it is *also given to us* Phil. 1. 29.
in the behalf of Christ to believe on him; and this gift is
 a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us an assent unto
 that which by the word is propounded to us: by this *the*
Lord opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended unto Act. 16. 14.
the things which were spoken of Paul; by this *the word*
preached profiteth being mixed with faith in them that Heb. 4. 2.
hear it. Thus by grace are we saved through faith, and
 that not of our selves, it is the gift of God. As the en- Ephes. 2. 8.
 crease

† This is the ancient determination of the second Araucan Council, Si quis sicut augmentum, ita etiam initium Fidei, ipsumque credulitatis affectum quo in e-

um credimus qui justificat impium, & ad regenerationem baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratiae donum, id est, per inspirationem Spiritus S. corrigentis voluntatem nostram ab infidelitate ad fidem, ab impietate ad pietatem, & naturaliter nobis inesse dicit, Apostolicis dogmatibus adversarius approbatur, beato Paulo dicente, *Confidimus quia qui cepit in vobis bonum opus perficiet usque in diem Domini nostri Iesu Christi*; & illud, *Vobis datum est pro Christo non solum ut in eum credatis, sed etiam ut pro illo patiamini*. Et, *Gratia salvi facti estis per fidem, non ex vobis, Dei enim donum est*, Can. 5. Concil. Araus. & Gennad. Eccl. Dogm. cap. 42.

* It was the known opinion of the Pelagians that it is in the power of man to believe the Gospel without any internal operation of the grace of God, and S. Austin was once of that opinion, Neque enim fidem putabam, says he, Dei gratia praeveniri, ut per illam nobis daretur quod posceremus utiliter, nisi quia credere non possemus, si non praecederet praeconium veritatis. Ut autem praedicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus nostrum esse proprium, & nobis ex nobis esse arbitraber. Quem meum errorem nonnulla Opuscula mea satis indicant ante Episcopatum meum scripta, D. Praedest. Sanct. l. 1. c. 3. But whatsoever he had so written before he was made a Bishop, he recalled and reversed in his R. tractations, l. 1. c. 23. and disputed earnestly against it as a part of the Pelagian Heresie. This, as the rest of Pelagianisme is renewed by the Socinians, who in the Racovian Catechisme deliver it in this manner, Nonne ad credendum Evangelio Spiritus S. interiore dono opus est? Nullo modo: neque enim in Scripturis legimus cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti Evangelio.

The second part of the Office of the Holy Ghost in the sanctification of man, is the regeneration and renovation of him. For our naturall corruption consisting in an aversion of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the will of God is wrought within us by the Spirit of God. For according to his mercy he saveth us, by the washing of regeneration, and renew-

ing of the Holy Ghost. So that except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God. We are all at first defiled by the corruption of our nature and the pollution of our sins; but we are washed, but we are sanctified, but we are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The second part then of the Office of the Holy Ghost is the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul.

The third part of this Office is to lead, direct, and govern us in our actions & conversations, that we may actually doe and perform those things which are acceptable and well pleasing in the sight of God. *If we live in the Spirit*, quickned by his Renovation, we *must also walk in the Spirit*, following his direction, led by his manuduction. And *if we walk in the Spirit, we shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh*; for we are not onely directed, but animated and acted in those operations by the Spirit of God, who giveth both to will and to doe, and as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. Moreover that this direction may prove more effectually, we are also guided in our prayers, and acted in our devotions by the same Spirit, according to the promise, *I will powre upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and of supplications*. Whereas then this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will he heareth us; and whereas we know not what we should pray for as we ought, the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the Saints according to the will of God. From which intercession especially I conceive he hath the name of the Paraclete given him by Christ, who said, *I will pray unto the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete*. For if any man sinne we have a Paraclete

1 Cor. 6. 11.

Gal. 5. 25.

Gal. 5. 16.

Rom. 8. 14.

Zach. 12. 10.

1 Jch. 5. 14.

Rom. 8. 26, 27.

Joh. 14. 16.

1 Joh. 2. 1.

O O O O

with

Rom. 8. 34.

† Παράκλησις
is five times u-
sed in the Scri-
ptures, and

that by S. John alone: four times in his Gospel, attributed to the Holy Ghost, once in his first Epistle, spoken of Christ. When it relates to the Holy Ghost, we translate it al-
ways Comforter, when to Christ we render it Advocate; of which diversity there
can be no reason, because Christ who is a Paraclete said that he would send another
Paraclete, and therefore the notion must be the same in both, ἄλλος Παράκλητος
ἀποστέλλωμαι, τῷ πνεύματι, ἄλλος ὡς ἐγώ. S. Chrys. If therefore in the language of
S. John Παράκλητος be a Comforter, then Christ is the Comforter, if Παράκλη-
τος be an Advocate, the Holy Ghost is the Advocate. The Vulgar Latine keeps the
Greek word in the Gospels Paracletus, but in the Epistle renders it advocatus. The
Syriack keepeth the Originall altogether נַשְׁרִיף, as being of ordinary use in the
writers of that and the Chaldee language, and therefore was not well translated Pa-
raclerus in the Gospels, and Advocatus in the Epistle, by Tremellius. That the La-
tines did use generally the word Paracletus for the Holy Ghost, as it is now in the Vul-
gar Latine, appeareth by the description of the Heresie of Montanus, which Tertul-
lian calls novam prophetiam de Paraclete inundantem, de Resur. Carnis, cap. 63.
& spiritalem rationem Paraclete aurore, contra Marcio. l. 1. c. 29. And yet the an-
cientest Latine Translations rendered it advocatus even in the Gospels in reference to
the Spirit. As we read it in Tertullian, Bene quod & Dominus usus hoc verbo
in persona Paracleti, non divisionem significavit sed dispositionem. Rogabo enim,
inquit, Patrem, & alium advocatum mitet vobis, Spiritum veritatis. Adv. Prax.
cap. 9. So Novatianus, Ego rogabo Patrem, & alium advocatum dabit vobis,
Nec non etiam subdidit illud quoque, Advocatus autem Spiritus S. quem missurus
est Pater, ille vos docebit, de Trinit. cap. 28. Cum venerit Advocatus ille quem
ego mittam, Apud S. Hilary. de Trinit. l. 8. Norwilt standing Consolator also is of
good antiquity. As we read in the same S. Hilary, Sumus nunc quidem consolati,
quia Dominus ait, Mitet vobis Pater & alium Consolatorem, Enar. in Plat.
125. And 'tis possible that some which used Advocatus might understand so much
for in the ancient Christian Latine, Advocare significeth to comfort, and Advocatio
consolation; as being the bare interpretations of παρακαλεῖν and παράκλησις. As
Tertullian translates παρακαλεῖσθαι πειθύντας, Isa. c. 1. 2. Advocare languentes.
Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 14. So when we read, Vx vobis divitibus, quia habetis con-
solationem vestram. Tertullian read it, Vx vobis divitibus, quoniam recepistis
advocationem vestram, Adv. Marcio: l. 4. c. 15. And speaking in his own language,
Beati, inquit flentes atque lugentes. Quis talia sine patientia tolerat? Iaque tali-
bus & advocatio & risus promittitur, De Patien. c. 11. And as S. Hilary read it,
so did S. August. expound it, Consolabuntur Spiritu S. qui maxime propterea Pa-
raclerus nominatur, id est, Consolator, De Serm. Dom. in Mente, l. 1. c. 4. Cum

Christus

Christus promiserit suis missurum se Paracletum, id est, Consolatorem vel Advocatum, contra Faustum l. 13. c. 17. Consolator ergo ille, vel Advocatus, utrumque enim interpretatur quod est Græce Paracletus, *Expos. in Joh. Tract. 94.* And as they read or expounded it, so did the Arabick Translator render it, by two several words, one in the Gospel, another in the Epistle, both signifying Consolator. Now what they meant by Advocatus is evident, that is one which should plead the cause of Christians against their Adversaries which accused and persecuted them, that as there is an Accuser which is a Spirit, even Satan, so there should be an Advocate to plead against that Accuser, even the Holy Spirit. Necessarius nobis est ros Dei, ut non comburamur, neque infructuosi efficiamur, & ubi accusatorem habemus, illic habeamus & Paracletum, *Iren. l. 3. c. 19.* Hic ipse (Spiritus) & in Prophetis populum accusavit, & in Apostolis advocationem gentibus præstitit. Nam illi ut accusarentur increbantur quia contempserant legem, & qui ex Gentibus credunt ut patrocinio Spiritus adjuvantur merentur, quia ad Evangelicam pervenire gestiunt legem, *Novatianus de Trin. cap. 29.* In this sense it was, that when Verius pleaded for the Gallican Martyrs before their persecutors, ἡξίω ἀκαθάρτων ἀπολογεῖσθαι, & ὡς εἰς ἀδελφῶν, end avowing to clear them from all impiety offered to them, he was called the Παράκλητος of the Christians, ἀνελήφθη καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον εἰς μυστήρων, παράκλητος Χριστιανῶν χρηματίζου, *Acta Martyrum Gal. apud Euseb. Hist. l. 5. c. 1.* In the same Notion did the ancient Rabbinus use the same word retained in their language, פִּרְקָלִי, as appeareth by that in the Pirke Avoth, cap. 4. תָּהָא פִּרְקָלִי לִי קוֹנֵה לִי חַיִּים מִצַּדִּיק וְיִשְׁרָאֵל תָּהָא פִּרְקָלִי לִי קוֹנֵה לִי חַיִּים מִצַּדִּיק וְיִשְׁרָאֵל. He which keepeth one commandment gaineth one Advocate, and he which transgresseth once getteth one Accuser. As therefore פִּרְקָלִי is קַטְרוֹרֶת, so פִּרְקָלִי is שׁוֹמְרוֹרֶת, or patronus qui causam rei agit. And so Advocatus is ordinarily understood, for him which pleadeth and maintaineth the cause of any one. But I conceive there were other Advocati, and especially παράκλητοι among the Greeks, who did not plead or maintain the cause, but did only assist with their presence, intervening and interceding by way of petition to the Judges, such as were the friends of the reus, called by him to his assistance, and interceding for him; in both which respects they were called παράκλητοι. As we read in *Illius*, τοὺ φίλους παρεγγέλευτες, καὶ ῥήτορας παρεσκαδαπώδου; the ῥήτορες were to plead, the φίλοι παράκλητοι were to intercede. The action of these Advocati was called παράκλησις, and by the ancient Grammarians παράκλησις is interpreted δέησις; as Harpocration, τίς ἐστι μάλιστα ἀντί τῆς δέησις. Δυκῶρ, ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Ἰερυσί, περὶ πῶν, εἰ δὲ ὡς ἰδὼς ἰνδὸς ἦν ὁ ἀγων, ἐδεόμην ἐνὸς μετ' ἐν οἷας ἀκούσαι με, μετ' ὀλίγον φησὶ, Νυνὶ δὲ αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς οἶμαι ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ χάρις ᾧ παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐμῆς. And that the action of the παράκλητοι was δέησις, entreary, and petition, appeareth by those words of Demosthenes, εἰ δὲ εἰς παρακλήτων τέτων δέησις καὶ σπουδαὶ εἰς ἰδίαν πλεονεξιών ἐνεκα ἐξήντο, *Orat. ἐπὶ παρὰ τοῦ*. Of these παράκλητοι is *Æschines* to be understood, Τὴν δὲ παρακλήτην ὁρᾷτε, καὶ πῶς παρὰ τῶν ὄντων γέννηται, καὶ τὰς κατ' ἀγορὰν δέησις αἷς κέχλωται πνέες, *Orat. Κατὰ Κτησ.* Thus I conceive the notion of παράκλητος common to the Son and to the Holy Ghost to consist, especially in the office of intercession, which by Saint Paul is attributed to both. O o o o 2 Fourth-

Fourthly, the Office of the same Spirit is to joyn us unto Christ, and make us members of that one body of which our Saviour is the head. *For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body. And as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. a Hereby we know that God abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us. As we become spirituall men by the Spirit which is in us, as that union with the body and unto the head is a spirituall conjunction, so it proceedeth from the Spirit; and he that is joyned unto the Lord is one Spirit.*

1 Co. 12. 12, 13. *Dominus pollicitus est mittere se Paracletum qui nos sapiat Deo. Sicut enim de arido tritico massa una fieri non potest sine humore neque unus panis; ita nec nisi multi unum fieri in Christo Iesu poteramus sine aqua quæ de celo est, Irenæus lib. 3. cap. 19. a 1 Joh. 3. 24. b 1 Corinth. 6. 17.*

Fifthly, it is the Office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of the adoption of Sons, to create in us a sense of the paternall love of God toward us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. *The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God. And because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba Father. For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but we have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father. The Spirit it self bearing witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God. As therefore we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our Regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our Adoption: and because being sons we are also heires, heires of God, and joynt heires with Christ, by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest, of our inheritance. For he which establisheth us in Christ and hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us, and hath given the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts; so that*

Rom. 5. 5.
Rom. 8. 14.
Gal. 4. 6.
Rom. 8. 15, 16.
Rom. 8. 17.
2 Cor. 1. 22.

that we are sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which Eph. i. 14. is the earnest of our inheritance untill the redemption of the purchased possession. The Spirit of God as given unto us in this life, though it have not the proper nature of a pledge; as in the gifts received here being no way equivalent to the promised reward, nor given in the stead of any thing already due; yet is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon the condition of performance of the Covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received.

† The word ἀρραβών which the Apostle only useth in this particular, is of an Hebrew exaction, ארבע from

It is a word of promise and engagement in commerce, bargaines, and agreements; and being but in one particular affair used in the old Testament, is taken for a pledge, Gen. 38. 17, 18, 20. and translated ἀρραβών by the LXX. as well as ארבעה by the Chaldee; yet the Greek word otherwise, consonantly enough to the origination, significth rather an earnest than a pledge, as the Greeks and Latines generally agree. Helych. Ἀρραβών, ἀπόδομα. Etym. Ἀρραβών, ἡ ἐν ταῖς ἀνὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους διδομένη καταβολὴ ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας. which words are extant also in Suidas but corruptly. To this purpose is cited that of Menander, Μισθὸν ἀρραβὼν μὲν ἔσθην εὐδὺς καταβαλεῖν. So the Latines, Arrabo sic dicta ut reliquum reddatur. Hoc verbum à Græco ἀρραβών. Reliquum ex eo quod debitum reliquit, Varro de L. L. lib. 4. Pignus Latinus Interpres pro arrabone posuit. Non idiplum autem arrabo quod pignus sonat. Arrabo enim futuræ emptioni quasi quoddam testimonium & obligamentum datur. Pignus vero, hoc est, ἐπίχευον, pro mutua pecunia opponitur, ut cum illa reddita fuerit reddenti debitum pignus à creditore reddatur, S. Hieron. ad Ephes. 1. 14. There is such another obligation in A. Gellius, upon these words of Q. Claudius, Cum tantus arrhabo penes Samnites Populi Romani esset. Arrabonem dixit sexcentos obsoles, & id magis quam pignus dicere, quoniam vis hujus vocabuli in ea sententia gravior accriorque est, Nostr. Att. lib. 17. cap. 2. The sense and use of this word is evident in Plautus, Eas quanti destinat? Talentis magnis totidem, quot ego & tu sumus. Sed arrhaboni has dedit quadraginta minas, Mostell. via. The summe was 200 l. of which he gave 40 l. in part of payment, and this was the arrhabo. So the Greek Fathers interpret S. Paul, Διὰ μέντοι ἀρραβῶν ἡ ἰσχὺς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὸ μέγεθος. ὃ καὶ ἀρραβῶν μισθὸν τι μέγιστον ἐστὶ τοῦ παντός. Theodoret 20. 1. 22. Οὐδὲ Πνεῦμα ἔστιν ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἀρραβῶνα ὀνόμασιν, ἵνα ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ τοῦ παντός διαρρήξῃς, S. Chrysost.

Sixty, for the effecting of all these and the like particulars, it is the Office of the same Spirit to sanctifie and set apart Persons for the duty of the Ministry, ordein

Eph. 4. 12.

Act. 20. 28.

* In respect of
the nature of the
Holy Ghost I
have endeavour-
ed the same

which Faustus Rhegiensis did, of whom Gennadius relates thus much; Faustus ex Abbate Lirinenſis Monasterii apud regnum Galliarum Episcopus factus, vir in divinis Scripturis satis intentus, ex traditione Symboli occasione accepta, composuit librum de Spiritu S. in quo ostendit eum juxta fidem Patrum, & consubstantialem & coeternalem esse Patri & Filio, ac plenitudinem Trinitatis obtinere.

ning them to intercede between God and his people, to send up prayers to God for them, to bless them in the name of God, to teach the doctrine of the Gospel, to administer the Sacraments instituted by Christ, to perform all things necessary *for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* The same Spirit which illuminated the Apostles, and endued them with power from above to perform personally their Apostolicall functions, fitted them also for the ordination of others, and the committing of a standing power to a successive Ministry unto the end of the world; who are thereby obliged to *take heed unto their selves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers to feed the Church of God.*

By these and the like means doth the Spirit of God sanctifie the Sons of men, and by virtue of this sanctification, proceeding immediately from his Office, he is properly called the Holy Spirit. And thus have I sufficiently described the object of our faith contained in this Article, what is the Holy Ghost in whom we believe, both in relation to his * Nature, as he is the Spirit of God, and in reference to his Office, as he is the Holy Spirit.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth first from the nature and condition of the Creed whereof it is an essentiall part, as without which it could not be looked upon as a Creed. For being the Creed is a Profession of that faith into which we are baptized, being the first Rule of Faith was derived from the sacred form of Baptisme, being we are baptized *in the name of the Father, and of the*

Person, but also for a desire of the excellency of his graces, and the abundance of his gifts. What the Apostle wished to the *Corinthians*, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with us all.* For if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; if he have not that which maketh the union, he can not be united to him: if he acknowledge him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant; and no man can say that *Jesus is the Lord*, but by the Holy Ghost. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit; such is their felicity which have it; that which is born of the flesh is flesh; such is their infelicity which want it. What then is to be desired in comparison of the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ; especially considering the encouragement we receive from Christ, who said, *If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?*

Thirdly, it is necessary to professe faith in the Holy Ghost, that *the will of God* may be effectually in us, even our sanctification. For if God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit; if we be elected according to the foreknowledge of God the Father through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience, if the office of the Spirit doth consist in this, and he be therefore called Holy because he is to sanctifie us, how should we follow peace with all men and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord? how should we endeavour to cleanse our selves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God? The temple of God is holy, which temple we are, if the Spirit of God dwelleth in us; for the inhabitation of God is a consecration; and that place must be a temple where his honour dwelleth. Now if we know that our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost within us which we have of God, if

we know that *we are not our own*, for that *we are bought with a price*; we must also know that we ought *therefore to glorifie God in our body and in our spirit, which are Gods*. Thus is it necessary to believe in the Spirit of sanctification, that *our hearts may be established unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints*. 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. 1 Thess. 3. 13.

Fourthly, it is necessary to believe in the Holy Ghost, that in all our weaknesses we may be strengthened, in all our infirmities we may be supported, in all our discouragements we may be comforted, in the midst of miseries we may be filled with peace and inward joy. *For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*. We read of the Disciples at first, that they *were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost*; and those which afterwards became followers of them and of the Lord, *received the word in much affliction, but with joy of the Holy Ghost*. These are the rivers of living water flowing out of his belly that believeth; this is the oyl of gladness wherewith the Son of God was anointed above his fellows, but yet with the same oyl his fellows are anointed also: for *we have an unction from the Holy one, and the anointing which we receive of him abideth in us*. Rom. 14. 17. Act. 13. 52. 1 Thess. 1. 6. Joh. 7. 38. Psal. 45. 7. Heb. 1. 9. 1 Joh. 2. 20, 27.

Lastly, the belief of the Holy Ghost is necessary for the continuation of a successive Ministry, and a Christian submission to the acts of their function, unto the end of the world. For as God the Father sent the Son, and the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he had anointed him to preach the Gospel, so the Son sent the Apostles, saying, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive the Holy Ghost: and as the Son sent the Apostles, so did they send others by the virtue of the same Spirit, as S. Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to* Luc. 4. 18. Joh. 20. 21, 22.

P P P P Timothy,

1 Tim. 5. 22.

Tit. 1. 5.

1 Pet. 5. 2.

Heb. 13. 7, 17.

Timothy, Lay hands suddenly on no man, and to Titus, For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordein Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee. Thus by virtue of an Apostolicall Ordination there is for ever to be continued a Ministeriall succession: Those which are thus separated by Ordination to the work of the Lord, are to feed the flock of God which is among them, taking the oversight thereof; and those which are committed to their care, are to remember and obey them that have the rule over them, and submit themselves, for that they watch for their soules as they that must give account.

Having thus at large asserted the verity contained in this Article, and declared the necessity of believing it, we may easily give a brief exposition, by which every Christian may know what he ought to professe, and how he is to be understood, when he saith, *I believe in the Holy Ghost.* For thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I freely and resolutely assent unto this as unto a certain and infallible truth, that beside all other whatsoever, to whom the name of Spirit is or may be given, there is one particular and peculiar Spirit, who is truly and properly a person, of a true reall and personall subsistence, not a created but uncreated Person, and so the true and one eternall God; that though he be that God, yet is he not the Father nor the Son, but the Spirit of the Father and the Son, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son: I believe this infinite and eternall Spirit to be not onely of perfect and indefectible holinesse in himself, but also to be the immediate cause of all holinesse in us, revealing the pure and undefiled will of God, inspiring the blessed Apostles, and inabling them to lay the foundation, and by a perpetuall succession to continue the edification of the Church, illuminating the understandings of particular persons, rectifying their wills and

and affections, renovating their natures, uniting
their persons unto Christ, assuring them of the ad-
option of Sonnes, leading them in their actions, di-
recting them in their devotions, by all wayes and
means purifying and sanctifying our soules and bodies;
to a full and eternall acceptation in the sight of God.
This is the eternall Spirit of God; in this manner
is that Spirit holy; and thus *I believe in the Holy
Ghost.*

Pppp 2

ARTI.

ARTICLE IX.

THE HOLY CATHOLICK CHURCH,
THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

Although generally the Article of the Holy Church did immediately follow the Article of the Holy Ghost, as Terullian well ob-

*serves, Cum sub tribus & testatio fidei & sponso salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiae mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est Pater & Filius & Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia quæ trium corpus est, De Baptismo, c. 6. and the Author of the first book de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Sequitur post S. Trinitatis commendationem S. Ecclesia. Yet notwithstanding this order was not alwayes observed, but sometimes this Article was reserved to the end of the Creed. As first appeareth in that remarkable place of S. Cyprian, Quod si aliquis illud opponit ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem Symbolo quod & nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum S. ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in Interrogatione baptismi à nobis non discrepare; sciat quisquis & hoc opponendum putat, primum non esse unam nobis & Schismaticis Symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, Credis remissionem Peccatorum & vitam eternam per sanctam Ecclesiam? mentiuntur in interrogatione, cum non habeant Ecclesiam. Tunc deinde voce sua ipsi confitentur remissionem peccatorum non dari nisi per Sanctam Ecclesiam, Epist. ad Magnum. Thus Arius and Euzo-
nus in the words hereafter cited, place the Church in the conclusion of their Creed. And the Author of the second book De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, placeth the Remission of sinnes after the Holy Ghost, Noli injuriam facere ei qui te fecit, ut consequaris ab illo quod in isto S. Symbolo sequitur, Remissionem omnium peccatorum, and after he hath spoken of the Resurrection and life everlasting, proceedeth thus to speak of the Church, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis Sacramenti terminatur autoritas, &c. The Author of the third, Ideo Sacramenti hujus conclusio per Ecclesiam terminatur quia ipsa est mater fecunda. And the Author of the fourth, Per sanctam Ec-*
clesiam.

To

clesiam. Propterea hujus conclusio Sacramenti per S. Ecclesiam terminatur, quoniam si quis absque ea inventus fuerit, alienus erit à numero filiorum; nec habebit Deum Patrem qui Ecclesiam noluerit habere matrem. *Thus they fore they disputed the last part of the Creed, Credo in Spiritum S. peccatorum remissionem, carnis resurrectionem & vitam æternam per S. Ecclesiam. And the designe of this transposition was to signifie that remission of sinnes, and a resurrection to eternall life, are to be obtained in and by the Church. As the Creed in the first Homily under the name of S. Chrysostome, Credo in Spiritum S. Iste Spiritus perducit ad S. Ecclesiam, ipsa est quæ dimittit peccata, promittit carnis resurrectionem, promittit vitam æternam.*

† So Rufinus, Sanctam Ecclesiam. For Catholicam is added by Pamelius. So S. Hierome contra Lucifer. Præterea cum solenne sit in lavacro post Trinitatis Confessionem interrogare. Credis Sanctam Ecclesiam? Credis remissionem peccatorum? Quam Ecclesiam credidisse eum dices? Ariatorum? sed non habent; nostram? sed extra hanc baptizatus non potuit eam credere quam nescivit; and S. August De Fide & Symb. Credimus & sanctam Ecclesiam, with this declaratio, utique Catholicam. So Maximus Taurin. Chrysol. and Venantius Fortunatus. The Author of the first Book de Symb. ad Catechum. Sequitur post sanctæ Trinitatis commendationem Sancta Ecclesia. The Author of the other three, who placeth this Article last of all, Sancta Ecclesia, in qua omnis hujus sacramenti terminatur authoritas, l. 2. and l. 4. expressly Per Sanctam Ecclesiam, as the words of the Creed with the explication before mentioned. As also the Interrogation of the Novatians ending with per Sanctam Ecclesiam, cit. d the last page out of Saint Cyprian. So likewise of those two Homilies on the Creed which are falsely attributed to S. Chrysostome, the first hath Sanctam Ecclesiam after the Belief in the Holy Ghost, the second concludeth the Creed with per Sanctam Ecclesiam. In Carnis resurrectione fides, in vita æterna spes, in Sancta Ecclesia charitas. Thus the Ancient Saxon Creed set forth by Freherus, Tha halgan gelathing, i. e. the holy Church; the Greek Creed in Saxon letters in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, and the old Latine Creed in the Oxford Library. But though it were not in the Roman or Occidentall Creeds, yet it was anciently in the Orientall, particularly in that of Hierusalem, and that of Alexandria. In the Creed at Jerusalem it was certainly very ancient, for it is expounded by S. Cyril Archbishop of that place, *ὁς μὲν ἀγίας Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.* And in the Alexandrian it was as ancient, for Alexander Archbishop of that place inserts it in his Confession, in his Epistle ad Alexandrum, *μὲν καὶ καθολικὴν τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν,* Theodoret Hist. l. 2. c. 4. And Arius and Euzoius in their Confession of faith given in to Constantine thus conclude, *καὶ ὁς καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τῇ Θεῷ, τὴν ἀπὸ πλεόντων ἕως ὅρων,* Socrates Hist. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 26. The same is also expressed in both the creeds the lesser and the greater delivered by Epiphanius in Ancorato; the words are repeated in the next Observation.

To begin then with the first part of the Article, I shall endeavour so to expound it, as to shew what is the meaning of the Church, which Christ hath propounded to us,

PPP 3. how

* Credo sanctam Ecclesiam, I believe there is an holy Church; or Credo in sanctam Ecclesiam, is the same: nor does the particle in added or substra-

how that Church is *holy*, as the Apostle hath assured us, how that holy Church is *Catholick*, as the Fathers have taught us. For when I say *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*, I mean that * there is a Church which is holy, and which is Catholick, and I understand that Church alone which is both Catholick and holy: and being this holiness and Catholicism are but affections of this Church which I believe, I must first declare what is the true nature and notion of the Church, how I am assured of the existence of that Church, and then how it is the subject of those two affections.

cted make any difference. For although some of the Latine and Greek Fathers presse the force of that Preposition, as is before observ'd, though Rufinus urge it far in this particular. Ut autem una eademque in Trinitate divinitas doceatur, sicut dictum est in Deo Patre credi adjecta præpositione, ita & in Christo Filio ejus, ita & in Spiritu S. memoratur. Sed ut manifestius fiat quod dicimus, ex consequentibus approbabitur. Sequitur namque post hunc sermonem, Sanctam Ecclesiam, remissionem peccatorum, hujus carnis resurrectionem. Non dixit, in sanctam Ecclesiam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem, si enim addidisset in præpositionem, una eademque vis fuisset cum superioribus. Ne autem (f. Nunc autem) in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi divinitate fides ordinatur, in Deo Patre dicitur, & Jesu Christo Filio ejus, & in Spiritu S. in exteris vero ubi non de divinitate sed de creaturis ac mysteriis sermo est, in præpositio non additur ut dicatur in sanctam Ecclesiam, sed sanctam Ecclesiam credendam esse, non ut in Deum sed ut Ecclesiam Deo congregatam; & remissionem peccatorum credendam esse, non in remissionem peccatorum, & resurrectionem carnis, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque præpositionis syllaba creator à creaturis secernitur & divina separantur ab humanis, Ruff. in Symb. Though I say, this expression be thus pressed; yet we are sure that the Fathers did use eis and in for the rest of the Creed as well as for the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. We have already produced the authorities of S. Cyril, Arius & Euzoius. p. 30. beside which we may observe that of Epiphanius in Ancorato, in his first and briefer confession, Εἰς Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰς μίαν αἰσίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν; in the latter and larger more expressly, πνεύματι εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλικὰν μετανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ἑσθλῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Thus also the Latines, as S. Cyprian, In æternam pœnam sero credent, qui in vitam æternam credere noluerunt, Ad Demetrianum. So Interpres Irenæi, Quotquot autem timent Deum, & credunt in adventum Filii ejus, &c. So Chrysost. In sanctam Ecclesiam. Quia Ecclesia in Christo, & in Ecclesia Christus est, qui ergo Ecclesiam fatetur, in Ecclesiam se confessus est credidisse, Serm. 62.

For the understanding of the true notion of the Church, first we must observe that the nominall definition or derivation of the word is not sufficient to describe the nature of it. If wee look upon the old *English* word now in use, *Church* or *Kyrke*, it is derived from the *Greek*, and first signified the house of the Lord, that is of Christ, and from thence was taken to signifie the people of God, meeting in the house of God. The *Greek* word used by the Apostles to expresse the Church, signifieth a calling forth, if we look upon the origination; a congregation of men, or a company assembled, if we consider the use of it. But neither of these doth fully expresse the nature of the Church, what it is in it self, and as it is propounded to our belief.

† *Kύριος* the Lord, and that properly Christ; from whence *Κυριακός* belonging to the Lord Christ, *οἶκος* the Lords house, from thence *Kyriac*, *Kyrke*, and

Our Church.

* The word used by the Apostles is *Ἐκκλησία*, from *ἐκκαλεῖν* evocate. From *ἐκκαλεῖν*, *ἐκκλησις*; from *ἐκκλησις* *ἐκκλησία*, of the same notation with the Hebrew *עֵקֶלֶסְיָה*, *ecclesia* quippe ex vocatione appellata est S. Aug. Exp. ad Rom. And though they ordinarily take it primarily to signifie convocation, as S. Aug. Inter congregationem, unde *synagoga*, & convocationem, unde *Ecclesia* nomen habet, distat aliquid, *Enar. in Psal. 177.* yet the Origination speaks onely of evocation, without any intimation of congregation or meeting together, as there is in *σύνκλητος*. From whence arose that definition of Methodius, *Ὁπ' Ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐκκαλεῖν τὰς ἡθύναις λέγουσι φησιν*, Photius Biblioth. whereas *ἐκκαλεῖν* is here no more then *καλεῖν*, *ἐκκλησις* no more then *κλησις*; as *κλητεύειν* and *ἐκκλητεύειν* with the Atticks were the same; From whence it came to passe that the same preposition hath bin twice added in the composition of the same word; from *ἐκκαλεῖν* *ἐκκλησία*, from thence *ἐκκλησιάζειν*, and because the preposition had no signification in the use of that word, from thence *ἐξἐκκλησιάζειν*, to convocate, or call together. But yet *ἐκκλησία* is not the same with *ἐκκλησις*, not the evocation or the action of calling, but the *κλησις*, or the company called, and that (according to the use) gathered together; from whence *ἐκκλησιάζειν* is to gather together, or to be gathered. Hence S. Cyril, *Ἐκκλησία ἡ καλεῖται φερωνύμως*, *διὰ τὸ πάντας ἐκκαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμῶς συνάγειν*, Catech. 18. so Ammonius, *Ἐκκλησίαν ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν συνάγον ἥν καὶ τὴν πόλιν*. To this purpose doe the LXX. use *ἐκκλησιάζειν* active γ, to convocate or call together in Assembly, as *ἐκκλησιάζειν λαόν*, and *ἐκκλησιάζειν συναγωγὴν*, and *ἐκκλησιάζεσθαι* passively, as *ἐκκλησιάζεσθαι πᾶσι ἡ συναγωγῇ*, which the Attick writers would have exp^{re}s'd by *ἐκκλησίαζε*, as Aristophanes, *Εὐδξέ μοι πρὶ φρῶτον ὕπνου ἐν τῇ πυκνῇ Ἐκκλησιάζειν πρὸς βατὰ συγκαθήμενα*, Vespis. Where though the Scho^{la}st bath rendred it *Ἐκκλησιάζειν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συνάγειν*, whereby the Lexicographers have bin deceived, yet the word is even there taken as a neuter, in the passive sense, as generally the Atticks use it. Howsoever from the notation of the word we

we cannot conclude that it signifies a number of men called together into one assembly out of the masse or generality of mankind; first, because the preposition *ex* hath no such force in the use of the word; secondly, because the collection or coming together is not specified in the origination.

Our second Observation is, that the Church hath bin taken for the whole complex of men and Angels worshipping the same God; and again, the Angels being not considered, it hath bin taken as comprehending all the sons of men believing in God ever since the foundation of the world. But being Christ took not upon him the nature of Angels, and consequently did not properly purchase them with his blood, or call them by his word; being they are not in the Scriptures mentioned as parts or members of the Church, nor can be imagined to be built upon the Prophets or Apostles, being we are at this time to speak of the proper notion of the Church, therefore I shall not look upon it as comprehending any more then the sons of men. Again, being though Christ was the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, and whosoever from the beginning pleased God, were saved by his blood; yet because there was a vast difference between the severall dispensations of the law and Gospel, because our Saviour spake expressly of building himself a Church when the *Jewish* Synagogue was about to fail, because Catholicisme, which is here attributed unto the Church, must be understood in opposition to the legall singularity of the *Jewish* nation, because the ancient * Fathers were generally wont to distinguish between the Synagogue and the Church, therefore I think it necessary to restrain this notion to Christianity.

* *Sacrificia in populo, sacrificia & in Ecclesia, Iren. l. 4. c. 34. Dissemnaverunt sermonem de Christo Patriarchæ & Prophetæ, demersa est autem*

Ecclesia, hoc est, fructum percepit, Id. l. 4. c. 24. Quid Judaicus populus circa beneficia divina perfidus & ingratus? nonne quod à Deo primum recessit impatientiæ crimen fuit? ... Impatientia etiam in Ecclesia hæreticos facit, S. Cypri. de Bono Patient. Quis non agnoscat Christum reliquisse matrem Synagogam Judæorum veteri Testamento carnaliter adhærentem, & adhæsisse uxori suæ S. Ecclesiæ, S. Aug. contra Faust. l. 12. c. 8. Mater sponsi Domini nostri Jesu Christi Synagoga est; proinde nurus ejus Ecclesia Idem Enar. in Psal. 44.

Thirdly,

Thirdly therefore I observe that the onely way to attain unto the knowledge of the true notion of the Church, is to search into the New Testament, and from the places there which mention it, to conclude what is the nature of it. To which purpose it will be necessary to take notice that our Saviour first speaking of it, mentioneth it as that which then was not, but afterwards was to be; as when he spake unto the great Apostle, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church*; but when he ascended into heaven, and the Holy Ghost came down, when Peter had converted *three thousand soules* which were added to the *hundred and twenty* disciples; then was there a Church, (and that built upon *† Peter*, according to our Saviours promise,) for after that we reade, *The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved*. A Church then our Saviour promised should be built, and by a promise made before his death; after his Ascension and upon the preaching of *S. Peter*, we find a Church built or constituted, and that of a nature capable of a daily encrease. We cannot then take a better occasion to search into the true notion of the Church of Christ, then by looking into the origination and encrease thereof.

Act. 2. 41.

Act. 1. 15.

Act. 2. 42.

† Qualis es convertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem, Super te, inquit, edificabo Ecclesiam meam, & dabo tibi claves,

non Ecclesiae. Sic enim & exitus docet: in ipso Ecclesia exstructa est, id est per ipsum, ipse clavem imbuat, vides quam. *Viri Israelitae, auribus mandate quod dico: Iesum Nazarenum virum a deo vobis destinatum, & reliqua*, Tertull. de Pudicitia, cap. 21. So S Basil, Εὐθὺς ὁ δὲ τῆς παντὶς ταύτης νομῆς Πάτριον... τὸν δὲ τῆς πίστεως ἀποροχὴν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δεξιόμενον, Adv. Eunom. lib. 2. S. Peter took upon himself the building of the Church, that is to build the Church, which he then performed, when he preached the Gospel by which the Church was first gathered.

Now what we are infallibly assured of the first actual existence of a Church of Christ is onely this. There were twelve Apostles with the Disciples, before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty. When the Holy Ghost

Act. 1. 15.

Q q q q

came

Act. 2. 38, 41,
42, 47.

came after a powerfull and miraculous manner upon the blessed Apostles, and S. Peter preached unto the Jewes, that they should repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sinnes; they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand soules. These being thus added to the rest, continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers: and all these persons so continuing are called the Church. What this Church was is easily determined, for it was a certain number of men, of which some were Apostles, some the former disciples, others were persons which repented, and believed and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and continued hearing the word preached, receiving the Sacraments administred, joyning in the publick prayers presented unto God. This was then the Church, which was dayly encreased by the addition of other persons received into it upon the same conditions, making up the multitude of them that believed, who were of one heart and one soul, believers added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.

Act. 4. 32.
4. 14.

But though the Church was thus begun, and represented unto us as one in the beginning, though that Church, which we professe to believe in the Creed be also propounded unto us as one; and so the notion of the first Church in the Acts of the Apostles might seem sufficient to expresse the nature of that Church which we believe; yet because that Church was one by way of origination, and was afterwards divided into many, the actuall members of that one becoming the members of severall Churches; and that Church which we believe, is otherwise one by way of complexion, receiving the members of all Churches into it; it will be necessary to consider how at the first those severall Churches were constituted, that we may understand how in this one Church they are all united. To which purpose it will be further fit to examine the severall

acceptations

acceptations of this word as it is diversly used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament, that, if it be possible, nothing may escape our search, but that all things may be weighed, before we collect and conclude the full notion of the Church from thence.

First then that word which signifies the Church in the Originall *Greek*, is sometimes used in the vulgar sense, according as the native *Greeks* did use the same to expresse their conventions, without any relation to the worship of God or Christ, and therefore is translated by the word *assembly*, of as great a latitude. Secondly, it is sometimes used in the same notion in which the *Greek* Translators of the Old Testament made use of it, for the Assembly of the people of God under the Law, and therefore might be most fitly translated the *Congregation*, as it is in the Old Testament. Thirdly, it has bin conceived that even in the Scriptures it is sometimes taken for the place in which the members of the Church did meet to perform their solemn and publick services unto God, and some passages there are which seem to speak no lesse, but yet are not so certainly to be understood of the place, but that they may as well be spoken of the people congregated in a certain place. Beside these few different acceptations, the Church in the language of the New Testament doth alwayes signifie a company of persons professing the Christian Faith, but not alwayes in the same latitude. Some

Act. 19. 32;
39, 40.

Act. 8. 38.
Heb. 2. 12.

† Act. 11. 26.
1 Cor. 11, 18,
22. From these
places S. Aug.
did collect that
Εκκλησία was
taken in the
Scriptures for
the place of

meeting, or the house of God, and came so to be frequently used in the language of Christians in his time. Sicut Ecclesia dicitur locus, quo Ecclesia congregatur. Nam Ecclesia homines sunt de quibus dicitur, *De exhiberet sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam*. Hanc tamen vocari etiam ipsam domum orationum idem Apostolus testis est, ubi in, *Nunquid domos non habetis ad manducandum & bibendum, Ecclesiam Dei contemnitis?* Et hoc quotidianus loquendi usus obtinuit, ut, ad Ecclesiam prodire, aut ad Ecclesiam confugere, non dicatur, nisi quod ad locum ipsum pariterque prodierit, vel confugerit quibus Ecclesie congregatio continetur, *Quest. super Levit. 1. 3. c. 37.* By the word it is certain that in S. Augustines time they understood Ecclesia, as we do now the Church, for a place set apart for the worship of God; and it is also certain that those of the Greek Church did use Εκκλησία in the

same sense, as Eusebius speaking of the flourishing times of the Church, before the persecution under Diocletian, sayes the Christians *μεταμὲς ἐπὶ τοῖς πόλεσι οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρχιερεῖς ἐυνοίας εἰς πᾶσι ἀνὰ πᾶσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θυμῶν ἀγίων ἐκκλησίαις*, Hist. lib. 8. cap. 1. But it is not so certain that the Apostle used *ἐκκλησία* in that sense, nor is it cert. in that there were any houses set apart for the worship of God in the Apostles times, wh. ch then could be called by that name. For Ildorus Pelusiotæ expressly de yēs it, and distinguishes betwixen *ἐκκλησία* and *ἐκκλησιαστικόν*, sfer this manner, *Ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία, καὶ ἄλλο ἐκκλησιαστικόν, ὃ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀμώμων ψυχῶν συνίστηκε, τὸ δὲ ὑπὸ ἀδῶν καὶ ξύλων οἰκοδομητόν*. And thus he proveth this distinction, *Ὡς περ γὰρ ἄλλο ἐστὶν δυσαστικόν καὶ ἄλλο δυοσία, καὶ ἄλλο θυμιατικόν καὶ ἄλλο θυμίαμα, καὶ ἄλλο βυλδοτικόν καὶ ἄλλο βυλή· τὸ δὲ γὰρ ἴσον ἐν τῷ συνδράσει μινύον, ὃ γὰρ τὸ βυλδοδωδὲς ἀδέρει, οἷς καὶ ὁ κινδωθὲ καὶ ἡ σωτηρία ἀνήκει, ἔτω καὶ ὁ τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*. Then he concludes that in the Apostles times there were no *ἐκκλησιαστικὰ*, *Ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀποστόλων ὅτι ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκοίματο χαλεκομασθαι μεθυστικοῖς, ἔβρουσι πολυτρίφ. λαμπρῶς, ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἐκ ἡν*, Epistol. 246. lib. 6.

times it admitteth of distinction and plurality, sometimes it reduceth all into conjunction and unity. Sometimes the Churches of God are diversified as many, sometimes, as many as they are, they are all comprehended in one.

For first in generall there are often mentioned the Churches by way of plurality, the Churches of God, the Churches of the Gentiles, the Churches of the Saints. In particular we find a few believers gathered together in the house of one single person, called a Church, as the Church in the house of *Priscilla* and *Aquila*, the Church in the house of *Nymphas*, the Church in the house of *Philemon*; which Churches were nothing else but the believing and baptized persons of each family, with such as they admitted and received into their house to joyn in the worship of the same God. Again, when the Scripture speaketh of any Country where the Gospel had bin preached, it

† Act. 16. 5.
1 Cor. 14. 34.
2 Cor. 8. 19,
23, 24. 11. 8,
28. 12. 13.
Rev. 22. 16.
1 Thessal. 1. 4.
1 Cor. 11. 16.
Rom. 16. 4.
1 Cor. 14. 23.
* Rom. 16. 5.
1 Cor. 16. 19.
Col. 4. 15.
Philem. 2.
S. Chryso-
some observeth of *Priscilla* and *Aquila*; *Οὕτω γὰρ ἦσαν εὐδαιμονοῦντες καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκκλησίαν ποιῆσαι, διὰ τὴν τῶν πιστῶν ποιῆσαι πύλιν, καὶ διὰ τὴν τοῖς ξένοις αὐτὴν ἀνοίξαι πᾶσιν*, Chrysost. Homil. 30. in Epistol. ad Romanos.

nameth alwayes by way of plurality the * Churches of * Gal. I. 22. that Countrey, as the Churches of *Judea*, of *Samaria* and *Galilee*, the Churches of *Syria* and of *Cilicia*, the Churches of *Galatia*, the Churches of *Asia*, the Churches of *Macedonia*. But notwithstanding there were severall such Churches or congregations of believers in great and populous cities, yet the Scriptures alwayes speak of such congregations in the notion of one Church. As when Saint Paul wrote to the *Corinthians*, a *Let your women keep silence in the Churches*, yet the dedication of his Epistle is, *Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth*. So we read not of the Churches, but the Church at *Jernsalem*, the Church at *Antioch*, the Church at *Casarea*, the Church at *Ephesus*, the Church of the *Theſſalonians*, the Church of *Laodicea*, the Church of *Smyrna*, the Church of *Pergamus*, the Church of *Thyatira*, the Church of *Sardis*, the Church of *Philadelphia*. From whence it appeareth that a collection of severall congregations, every one of which is in some ſenſe a Church, and may be called ſo, is properly one Church by virtue of the ſubordination of them all in one government under one ruler. For thus in thoſe great and populous Cities where Chriſtians were very numerous, not onely all the ſeverall Churches within the Cities, but thoſe alſo in the adjacent parts were united under the care and inſpection of one Biſhop, and therefore was accounted one Church; the number of the Churches following the number of the Angels, that is, the Rulers of them, as is evident in the *Revelation*.

Now as ſeverall Churches are reduced to the denomination of one Church, in relation to the ſingle Governour of thoſe many Churches, ſo all the Churches of all cities and all nations in the world may be reduced to the ſame ſingle denomination in relation to one ſupreme Governour of them all, and that one Governour is Chriſt the Biſhop of our ſoules. Wherefore the Apoſtle ſpeaking of that in which all Churches doe agree, comprehendeth them all

Act. 9. 31.
1 Cor. 16. 1,
19. Rev. 1. 11.
1 Theſſ. 2. 14.
2 Cor. 8. 1.
Gal. 1. 2.

a 1 Cor. 14. 34.
1 Cor. 1. 2.
Act. 8. 1, 11,
22. 13. 1. 15. 3.
18. 22. 20. 17.
2 Theſſ. 1. 1.
Col. 4. 16.
Rev 3. 14. 2. 8,
12, 18. 3. 1, 7.
And thus after
they grew yet
far more nu-
merous in the
time of Cle-
mens Biſhop of
Rome.

Ἡ ἐκκλησία
τῆς Θείας, ἡ πα-
ροικοῦσα τῆς πό-
λεως τῆς ἐκκλη-
σίας τῆς Θείας
παροικοῦσα
Κόρινθον, E-
piſt. 1. So after
him Ignatius,
τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
τῇ Ἱεροσολυμι-
τικῇ τῇ ὑπὸν
ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἀ-
σίας. And Ἐκ-
κλησία ἡ Ἰη-
σοῦς τοῦ Θεοῦ
λεον, And ſo
the reſt.

* Mat. 16. 18.
1 Cor. 12. 28.
15. 9. Gal. 1.
13. Eph. 1. 22.
3. 10, 21. 5. 23,
25, 27, 29, 32.
Phil. 3. 6. Col.
1. 18, 24. Heb.
12. 23.

† So the Creeds
of Epiphanius
in Anco. 110,
πιστευομεν εις
μιαν εζισαν κα-
θολικην καὶ Α-
ποστολικην Εκ-
κλησίαν, So
the Jerusalem
Creed in S. Cy-
ril. Thus the
Nicene with
the additions of
the Council of
Constantino-
ple, μίαν εζι-
σαν καθολικην
καὶ Αποστολι-
κην Εκκλησί-
αν. Thus also
the Alexandri-
an, as appear-
eth by those
already quoted
of Alexander,
Arius and Eu-
zoius.
Act. 2. 41, 42,
44, 47.

under the same appellation of one Church; and therefore often by the name of * Church are understood all Christians whatsoever belonging to any of the Churches dispersed through the distant and divided parts of the world. For the single persons professing faith in Christ are members of the particular Churches in which they live, and all those particular Churches are members of the Generall and Universall Church, which is one by unity of aggregation; and this is the Church in the Creed which we believe, and which is in other Creeds expressly termed † one, I believe in one holy Catholick Church.

It will therefore be further necessary for the understanding of the nature of the Church which is thus one, to consider in what that Unity doth consist. And being it is an aggregation not only of many persons, but also of many congregations, this unity must consist in some agreement of them all, and adhesion to something which is one. If then we reflect upon the first Church again which we found constituted in the Acts, and to which all other since have bin in a manner added and conjoynd, we may collect from their union and agreement how all other Churches are united and agree. Now they were described to be believing and baptized persons, converted to the faith by S. Peter, continuing stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers. These then were all built upon the same rock, all professed the same faith, all received the same Sacraments, all performed the same devotions, and thereby were all reputed members of the same Church. To this Church were added daily such as should be saved, who became members of the same Church by being built upon the same foundation, by adhering to the same doctrine, by receiving the same Sacraments, by performing the same devotions.

From whence it appeareth that the first unity of the Church lieth upon the originall of it which is one; even as an house built upon one foundation, though consisting

of many roomes, and every room of many stones, is not yet many but one house. Now there is but one foundation upon which the Church is built, and that is Christ: *For other foundation can no man lay, then that is layd, which is Jesus Christ.* And though the Apostles and the Prophets be also termed the foundation, yet even then the unity is preserved, because as they are stones in the foundation, so are they united by one corner stone; whereby it comes to passe that such persons as are of the Church, being fellow citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God, are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy Temple in the Lord. This stone was layd in Zion for a foundation, a tryed stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; there was the first Church built, and whosoever have bin, or ever shall be converted to the true Christian faith, are and shall be added to that Church, and layd upon the same foundation, which is the unity of † origination. Our Saviour gave the same power to all the Apostles, which was to found the Church, but he gave that power to Peter, to shew the unity of the same Church.

1 Cor. 3. 11.

Eph. 2. 19;
20, 21.

Isai. 28. 16.

† This is the
Unitas originis
which S. Cy-
prius so much
insists upon,
Ecclesia una

est quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur; quomodo Solis multi radii, sed lumen unum; & rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum. Et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copię largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine, &c. S. Cypr. de Unitate Eccl. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum, *Ego tibi dico*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus, & super istam petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam*, &c. Et eodem post resurrectionem suam dicit, *Pasce oves meas*. Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, & dicat, *Sicut misit me Pater, & ego mitto vos* &c. tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua autoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique & ceteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi, & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstraretur, *Ibid.* *Ἐνδὲς ὄντ' ὁ κύριος, καὶ ἔνδὲς τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἀκρὸς τίμιον καὶ τὸ μόνωτον ἐπισημαίνω, ὡς ἀρχὴς τῆς μᾶς*, Clem. Alexand. Stromat. lib. 7.

Secondly,

Ephes. 4. 5.
Jude 3.

Secondly, the Church is therefore one, though the members be many, because they all agree in one faith. There is *one Lord*, and *one faith*, and that faith *once delivered to the Saints*, which whosoever shall receive embrace and professe, must necessarily be accounted one in reference to that profession. For if a company of believers become a Church by believing, they must also become one Church by believing one truth. If they be one in respect of the foundation, which is ultimately one if we look upon Christ, which is mediately one, if we look upon the Apostles united in one corner-stone; if those which believe be therefore said to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles because they believe the doctrine which the Apostles preached, and the Apostles be therefore said to be of the same foundation, and united to the corner stone, because they all taught the same doctrine which they receiv'd from Christ, then they which believe the same doctrine delivered by Christ to all the Apostles, delivered by all the Apostles to believers, being all professors of the same faith, must be members of the same Church. And this is the
† *Unity of Faith.*

† *Of this doth*
Irenæus speak,
delivering the
summe or brief
abstract of the
materiall Ob-
ject of Faith,

τὸ κήρυγμα παρεληφῆα, καὶ ταύτῃ τὴν πίσιν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καὶ ὅν ὅλην τὴν κόσμον διασπαρμύνην ὀπμιλῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἓνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα, καὶ ὁμοίως περὶ τούτοις, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κηρύσσει καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παραδίδωσιν ὡς ἐν σώμα κακτημένη, Irenæus Adv. r. Hæret. lib. 1. Κατὰ τε σωτῆρας, κατὰ τε θηνοίαν, κατὰ τε ἀρχῶν, κατὰ τε ὁμοῦ, μόνῃ ἀναί φωνῇ τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ Καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν οἷς ἐνότητι πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς καὶ τὰς ἐξ ἑαυτῆς διαθήκης, μᾶλλον ὅ καὶ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφθερί τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐνδὲ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ βυλεύματι, δι' ἐνδὲ τῷ Κλεῖν Σωτήρι τῷ ἡδὴ κατατεταγμένῳ, ὡς παραδείσιν ὁ Θεός, διχάσις ἐστὶν περὶ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκός, Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. lib. 7. This unity of Faith followeth of unity of origination, because the true faith is the true foundation, Si qua est Ecclesia quæ fidem respuat, nec Apostolicæ prædicationis fundamenta possideat, deferenda est. Petra tua Christus est, S. Ambros. in Luc. lib. 2. cap. 9. Ἡ δὲ Σωτήρις τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Ποιμὴν, ἀρετὴν ἡ πίσις ἐστίν, Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. lib. 2. S. Jerom. in those words of the Psalm. 23. 11. Hæc est generatio quærentium Dominum, hath this observation. Superius singulariter dixit, Hic accipiet benedictionem, modo pluraliter, quia Ecclesia ex pluribus personis congregatur, & tamen una dicitur propter unitatem fidei.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, many persons and Churches, howsoever distinguished by time or place, are considered as one Church, because they acknowledge and receive the same Sacraments, the signes and badges of the people of God. When the Apostles were sent to found and build the Church, they received this Commission, *Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now as there is but one Lord, and one faith, so also is there but one baptism; and consequently they which are admitted to it, in receiving it are one. Again, at the institution of the Lords supper, Christ commanded saying, *Eat ye all of this, drink ye all of this,* and all by communicating of one, become as to that communication one. *For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* As therefore the Israelites were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spirituall meat, and did all drink the same spirituall drink, and thereby appeared to be the one people of God; so all believing persons, and all Churches congregated in the name of Christ, washed in the same laver of Regeneration, eating of the same bread, and drinking of the same cup, are united in the same cognizance, and so known to be the same Church. And this is the Unity of the Sacraments.

Fourthly, whosoever belongeth to any Church is some way called, and all which are so, are called in one hope of their calling: the same reward of eternall life is promised unto every person, and we all *through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.* They therefore which depend upon the same God, and worship him all for the same end, the hope of Eternall life, which God that cannot lye, promised before the world began, having all the same expectation may well be reputed the same Church. And this is the unity of hope.

Fifthly, they which are all of one mind, whatsoever

R r r r

the

Mar. 28. 19.

Eph. 4. 4.

1 Cor. 10. 17.

1 Cor. 10. 2.

3. 4.

Eph. 4. 4.

Galat. 5. 5.

Eph. 4. 3.

Ioh. 13. 35.

† Unus Deus
enim & Chri-
stus unus, Ec-
clesia ejus una,
fides una, &
plebs in solidā
corporis unita-
tem concordia
glutino copu-
lata, S. Cypr.

de Unitate Ecc.
* Episcopatus
unus est, cujus
à singulis inso-
lidū pars tene-
tur; Ecclesia u-
na est quæ in
multitudinem
largius incremē-
to fecunditatis
extenditur, S.
Cypr. *ibidem*.

* These are
all expressed by
Tertullian, U-
na nobis & illis
fides, unus De-
us, idem Chri-
stus, eadem
spes, eadem la-
vacri sacra-
menta; semel
dixerim, una
Ecclesia sumus,
de Virg. veland.

cap. 2. Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis, & disciplina unitate, & spi-

the number of their persons be, they are in reference to that mind but one; as all the members howsoever different, yet being animated by one soul, become one body. Charity is of a fastening and uniting nature, nor can we call those many, who *endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. By this, said our Saviour, shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.* And this is the † Unity of Charity.

Lastly, all the Churches of God are united into one by the unity of discipline and government; by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they have all the same pastorall guides appointed, authorised, sanctified and set apart by the appointment of God, by the direction of the Spirit, to direct and lead the people of God in the same way of eternall salvation, and this is the * U- nity of Regiment and discipline.

By these means and ** for these reasons, millions of persons, and multitudes of congregations are united into one body, and become one Church. And thus under the name of *Church* expressed in this Article, I understand a body, or collection of humane persons professing faith in Christ, gathered together in severall places of the world for the worship of the same God, and united into the same corporation by the means aforesaid. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the true notion of the Church as such, which is here the object of our faith; it remaineth there- fore that we next consider the existence of the Church; which is acknowledged in the act of faith applied to this object. For when I profess and say, *I believe a Church*, it is not onely an acknowledgement of a Church which hath bin, or of a Church which shall be, but also of that which is. When I say *I believe in Christ dead*, I acknow- ledge that death which once was, and now is not: for Christ once dyed, but now is not dead. When I say, *I be-*

live the resurrection of the body, I acknowledge that which never yet was, and is not now, but shall hereafter be. Thus the Act of Faith is applicated to the Object according to the nature of it; to what is already past, as past, to what is to come, as still to come, to that which is present, as it is still present. Now that which was then past when the Creed was made, must necessarily be alwayes past, and so believ'd for ever; that which shall never come to passe untill the end of the world, when this publick profession of faith shall cease, that must for ever be believ'd as still to come. But that which was when the Creed began, and was to continue till that Creed shall end, is proposed to our belief in every age as being; and thus ever since the first Church was constituted, the Church it self as being was the object of the faith of the Church believing.

The existence therefore of the Church of Christ (as that Church before is understood by us,) is the continuation of it in an actuall being, from the first collection in the Apostles times unto the consummation of all things. And therefore to make good this explication of the Article, it will be necessary to prove that the Church which our Saviour founded and the Apostles gathered, was to receive a constant and perpetuall accession, and by a successive augmentation be interruptedly continued in an actuall existence of believing persons and congregations in all ages unto the end of the world.

Now this indeed is a proper object of faith, because it is grounded onely upon the promise of God; there can be no other assurance of the perpetuity of this Church, but what we have from him that built it. The Church is not of such a nature as would necessarily, once begun, preserve it self for ever. Many thousand persons have fallen totally and finally from the faith professed, and so apostatized from the Church. Many particular Churches have bin wholly lost, many candlesticks have bin removed; neither

is there any particular Church which hath any power to continue it self more or longer then others; and consequently, if all particulars be defectible, the Universall Church must also be subject of it self unto the same defectibility.

- But though the providence of God doth suffer many particular Churches to cease, yet the promise of the same God will never permit that all of them at once shall perish. When Christ spake first particularly to *S. Peter*, he sealed his speech with a powerfull promise of perpetuity, saying, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*
- Mat. 16. 18.
- When he spake generally to all the rest of the Apostles, to the same purpose, *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* he added a promise to the same effect, *and loe I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* The first of these promises assureth us of the continuance of the Church, because it is built upon a rock; for our Saviour had expressed this before, *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.* The Church of Christ is the house of Christ, for he hath builded the house, and is as a Son over his own house, whose house are we; and as a wise man, he hath built his house upon a rock, and what is so built shall not fall. The latter of these promises giveth not onely an assurance of the continuance of the Church, but also the cause of that continuance, which is the presence of Christ. *Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ,* there he is in the midst of them, and thereby they become a Church, for they are as a builded house, and the Son within that house. Wherefore being Christ doth promise his presence unto the Church, even to the end of the world, he doth thereby assure
- Mat. 28. 19, 23.
- Mar. 7. 24, 25.
- Heb. 3. 3, 6.

assure us of the existence of the Church, untill that time, of which his presence is the cause. Indeed, this is *the City of the Lord of hosts, the City of our God, God will establish it for ever*, as the great Prophet of the Church hath said. Psal. 48. 8.

Upon the certainty of this truth the existence of the Church hath bin propounded as an object of our faith in every age of Christianity; and so it shall be still unto the end of the world. For those which are believers are the Church, and therefore if they doe believe, they must believe there is a Church. And thus having shewed in what the nature of a Church consisteth, and proved that a Church of that nature is of perpetuall and indefectible existence by virtue of the promises of Christ, I have done all which can be necessary for the explication of this part of the Article, *I believe the Church*.

After the consideration of that which is the subject in this Article, followeth the explication of the affections thereof; which are two, Sanctity and Universality; the one attributed unto it by the Apostles, the other by the Fathers of the Church: by the first the Church is denominated *Holy*, by the second *Catholick*. Now the Church which we have described, may be called holy in severall respects, and for severall reasons; First, in reference to the Vocation by which all the members thereof are called, and separated from the rest of the world to God; which separation in the language of the Scriptures is a sanctification, and so the calling being holy, (for *God hath called us with an holy calling*.) the body which is separated and congregated thereby, may well be termed holy. Secondly, in relation to the offices appointed, and the powers exercised in the Church, which by their institution and operation are holy, that Church for which they were appointed, and in which they are exercised, may be called holy. Thirdly, because whosoever is called to professe faith in Christ, is thereby engaged to holinesse of life, according to the words of the Apostle, *Let every one that* 2 Tim. 1. 9.

Act. 9. 14, 21.
vide 1 Cor. 1. 2.

nameth the name of Christ, depart from iniquity: for those namers of the name, or named by the name of Christ, are such as called on his name, and that was the description of the Church; as when Saul did persecute the Church, it is said he had authority from the chief Priests to bind all that call'd upon the name of Christ, and when he preached Christ in the Synagogues, all that heard him said, Is not this he who destroyed them which called on his name in Jerusalem? Being then all within the Church are by their profession obliged to such holiness of life, in respect of this obligation the whole Church may be termed holy. Fourthly, in regard the end of constituting a Church in God, was for the purchasing an holy and a precious people; and the great design thereof was for the begetting and encreasing holiness, that as God is originally holy in himself, so he might communicate his sanctity to the sons of men, whom he intended to bring unto the fruition of himself, unto which without a previous sanctification they can never approach, because without holiness no man shall ever see God.

Ephes. 5. 25, 26, 27.

For these four reasons the whole Church of God, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed holy, But the Apostle hath also delivered another kind of holiness which cannot belong unto the Church taken in so great a latitude. For, saith he, *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctifie and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.* Now though it may be conceived that Christ did love the whole Church as it did any way contain all such as ever call'd upon his name, and did give himself for all of them: yet we cannot imagine that the whole body of all men could ever be so holy, as to be without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or

any

any such thing. It will be therefore necessary within the great complex body of the Universall Church, to find that Church to which this absolute holinesse doth belong: and to this purpose it will be fit to consider both the difference of the persons contained in the Church, as it hath bin hitherto described, while they continue in this life, and their different conditions after death; whereby we shall at last discover in what persons this holinesse is inherent really, in what condition it is inherent perfectly, and consequently in what other sense it may be truly and properly affirmed that the Church is holy.

Where first we must observe that the Church as it embraceth all the professours of the true faith of Christ containeth in it not onely such as doe truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites and profane. Many professe the faith, which have no true belief: many have some kind of faith, which live without correspondence to the Gospel preach'd. Within therefore the notion of the Church are comprehended good and bad, being both externally called, and both professing the same faith. For the *Kingdome of heaven is like unto a field in which wheat and tares grow together into the harvest; like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; like unto a floore in which are laid up wheat and chaff; like unto a marriage feast, in which some have on the wedding garment, and some not.* This is that Ark of Noah in which were preserved beasts clean, and unclean. This is that *great house in which there are not onely vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood, and*

Mat. 13. 24,
30, 47.

Mat. 3. 12.

Firmissime te-
ne & nullare-
nus dubites a-
ream Dei esse

Ecclesiam Catholicam, & intra eam usque in finem sæculi frumento mixtas paleas contineri, hoc est, bonis malos sacramentorum communione misceri, Fulgent. ad Petrum, cap. 43, Mat. 22. 10. 2 Tim. 2. 20. S. Jerome joynes these two together, Arca Noe Ecclesie typus; ut in illa omnium animalium genera, ita & in hac universarum & gentium & morum homines sunt; ut ubi pardus & leonardi, lupus & agni, ita & hic iusti & peccatores, id est, vasa aurea & argentea cum ligneis & strilibus commorantur, Dialog. contra Luciferianos.

of

of earth, and some to honour, and some to dishonour. There are many called, of all which the Church consisteth, but there are few chosen, of those which are called, and thereby within the Church. I conclude therefore, as the ancient Catholicks did against the † Donatists, that within the Church, in the publick profession and externall communion thereof, are contained persons truly good and sanctified, and hereafter saved; & together with them other persons voyd of all saving grace, and hereafter to be damned.

† The Opinion of the Donatists confused by the Catholicks is to be seen in S. Austin's book in-

tituled Breviculus Collationū. Upon which reflecting in his book Post Collationē, he observes how they were forced by the testimony of those Scriptures which we have produced to acknowledge that there were mingled with the good such as were occultly bad, Ecce etiam ipsi veritate Evangelica non aliud coacti sunt confiteri quam malos occultos nunc ei permixtos esse, as the good and bad fish are taken in the same net, because it could not discern the bad from the good. And from thence be inferreth fr m their acknowledgement, that those which are apparently evil, are contained in the same Church. Si enim propterea rebus bonos & malos congregantibus Ecclesiam comparavit, quia malos in Ecclesia non manifestos sed latentes intelligi voluit, quos ita nesciunt sacerdotes, quemadmodum sub fluctibus quid acceperint retia nesciunt Piscatores. Propterea ergo & arca comparata est, ut etiam manifeste mali cum bonis in ea prænuntiarentur futuri. Neque enim palca quæ in arca est permixta frumentis, etiam ipsa sub fluctibus latet, quæ sic omnium oculis est conspicua, ut potius occulta sint in ea frumenta, cum sit ipsa manifesta, Lib. post. Collat. cap. 9, 10.

Of these promiscuously contained in the Church, such as are voyd of all saving grace while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and when they pass out of this life, dye in their sinnes, and remain under the eternall wrath of God; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto which they were called, and being by death separated from the externall Communion of the Church, and having no true internall communion with the members and the head thereof, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are effica-

efficaciously called justified, and sanctified, while they live are truly holy, and when they dye are perfectly holy; not are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of that internall union by which they were before conjoynd both to the members and the head. As therefore the Church is truly holy, not only by an holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these Saints while they live, so is it also perfectly holy, in relation to the same Saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, & consequently all cut off from the communion of the Church, when the members of the Church remaining, being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified, then shall the whole Church be truly and perfectly holy.

Then shall that be completely fulfilled, that *Christ shall present unto himself a glorious Church, which shall be holy and without blemish.* Eph. 2. 27. Not that there are two Churches of Christ, one in which good and bad are mingled together, another in which there are good alone; one in which the Saints are imperfectly holy, another in which they are perfectly such; but one and the same Church, in relation to † different times, admitteth or not admitteth the permixtion of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly. To conclude, the Church of God is universally holy in respect of all, by institutions and administrations of sanctity; the same Church is really holy in this world, in relation to all godly persons contained in it, by a really infused sanctity; the same is further yet at the same time perfectly holy in reference to the Saints departed expressius ostendentes quid dixerint, id est, non eam Ecclesiam quæ nunc habet permixtos malos alienam se dixisse à regno Dei, ubi non erunt mali commixti, sed eandem ipsam unam & sanctam Ecclesiam nunc esse aliter, tunc autem aliter futuram, nunc habere malos mixtos tunc non habituram, sicut nunc mortalem quod ex mortalibus constaret hominibus, tunc autem immortalem, quod in ea nullus esset vel corpore moriturus, sicut non ideo duo Christi, quia prior mortuus postea non moriturus, S. Aug. Collat. 3. diei.

† This was it which the Catholics answered to the Donatists, objecting that they made two distinct churches. De duabus etiam Ecclesiis calumniam eorum Catholici refutarunt identitatem.

ted and admitted to the presence of God ; and the same Church shall hereafter be most completely holy in the world to come , when all the members actually belonging to it, shall be at once perfected in holiness and completed in happiness. And thus I conceive the affection of sanctity sufficiently explicated.

The next affection of the Church is that of Universality , *I believe the holy CATHOLICK Church.* Now the word *Catholick* as it is not read in the Scriptures, so was it not anciently in the Creed (as we have already shewn) but being inserted by the Church must necessarily be interpreted by the sense which the most ancient Fathers had of it, and that sense must be confirmed, so far as it is consentient with the Scriptures. To grant then that the word was not used by the † Apostles , we must also acknowledge that it was most anciently in use among the Primitive Fathers, and that as to severall intents. For first, they called the Epistles of S. James , S. Peter , S. John , S. Jude , the * Catholick Epistles, because

† *It was the ordinary objection of the Schismaticall Novatians that the very name of Catholicks was never used by the Apostles, and the answer to it by the Catholicks was by way of confession. Sed sub Apostolis, inquit, nemo Catholicus vocabatur ; Esto, si fuerit, vel illud indulge, &c. Pacianus ad Sympronianum, Epist. 1.* * So S. Jerome of S. James , Unam tantum scripsit Epistolam quæ de septem Catholicis est. Of S. Peter, Scripsit duas Epistolas quæ Catholicæ nominantur. Of Saint Jude , Judas frater Jacobi , parvam quidem , quæ de septem Catholicis est, Epistolam reliquit. *This therefore was the common Title of these Epistles in S. Jerome's time among the Latines, and before among the Greeks, as appeareth by Eusebius, Τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰδωβον, ἔῃ πρώτη τῇ ὀνομαζομένην Καθολικὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔῃ λέγει, ἰστέον ὡς νοθεύει ἡ καὶ πολλὰ ῥωμὴ τῇ πάλαι αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευε, ὡς ἔδεν τὴν λαομένην Ἰδωβίαν καὶ αὐτὴ ἔσῃ τῇ ἐπὶ τῇ Καθολικῇ.* Hist. lib. 2. 23. before the time of Eusebius, as appeareth by Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria , Ὁ ὅς Εὐαγγελιστὴς ἔδεν τῆς Καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς περιέγραψεν αὐτῇ τὸ ὄνομα, Euseb. Hist. l. 7. c. 25. and before him, as appeareth by Origen, Διδίκεται ὅτι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ὡς Πέτρος ὁ ὑπογράφει αὐτὸ ποιήσασθαι ; ὃν καὶ ἔδεν ἐν τῇ Καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τῶν ὁμολόγησιν, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. cap. 25. Thus anciently Epistola Catholica was used for a General Epistle, and so continued, not onely in relation to the Scriptures, but to the Epistles of others, as Eusebius of Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, Χρησιμώτατον πάντων ἐαυτὸν καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ ὑπογράφειτο Καθολικῆς πρὸς ἅς ἐκκλησίας Ἐπιστολῆς, Hist. lib. 4. cap. 23.

when

when the Epistles written by S. Paul were directed to particular Churches congregated in particular Cityes, these were either sent to the Churches dispersed through a great part of the world, or directed to the whole Church of God upon the face of the whole earth. Again, we observe the Fathers to use the word Catholick for nothing else but generall, or universall in the ordinary or vulgar sense; as the * Catholick resurrection is the resurrection of all men. Sometimes it was used as a word of state signifying an Officer which collected the Emperours revenue in severall Provinces united into one Diocesse, who because there were particular Officers belonging to the particular Provinces, and all under him, therefore he was called the † *Catholicus* as Generall Procurator of them all, from whence that title was by some transferred upon the Christian Patriarchs.

* So Justine Martyr, Με-
τὰ ταῦτα πάλιν
Καθολικὴν ἔχον
(συμβαλόντων φά-
ναι) αἰωνίαν
ὁμοθυμαδὸν
ἀμα πάντων
ἀνάστασιν γε-
νήσεται καὶ χρί-
σιν, Dial. adv.

Trypho. So Tertullian uses Catholick for ex toto, Ab eo permittatur vel impere-
tur necesse est, catholicè fieri hæc, à quo & ex parte, De Fuga in Pers. and for
generaliter, Esi quædam inter domesticos diserebant, non tamen ea fuisse cre-
dendum est, quæ aliam regulam fidei superducerent, diversam & contrariam illi
quam catholicè in medium proferebant, De præsc. adv. Hæret. c. 26.

† We read in the old Glossary, Καθολικός, Rationalis; that is, the Receiver of the Im-
periall Revenue; not that it signifies so much of it self, but because he was the Ge-
nerall Receiver, and so not from receiving or accounting, but for the Generality of
his accounts in respect of others, who were inferiour, and whose receipts and accounts
were more particular; therefore he was called Catholicus. Thus Constantine signi-
fied to Cæcilianus Bishop of Carthage, that he had written to his Procurator Generall
to deliver him monies, Ἐδωκε γράμματα πρὸς Οὐρσον τὸν διασημώτατον Καθ-
ολικὸν τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, καὶ ἐδήλωσε αὐτῷ ὅπως τετραχίλις φόβας ἢ σὺ τετράκοιτα ἀπα-
ριθμήσαι φροντίσῃ, Euseb. Hist. lib. 10. cap. 6. And in the same manner to Eu-
sebius, Ἀπίστανται ὅτι γράμματα πρὸς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡμετέρας πρὸς τὸν τῆς
δοικῆσεως Καθολικὸν ὅπως αὐτὰ πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπιτήδεα
παροχῇ φροντίσῃεν, Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 9.

When this title is attributed to the Church it hath not
alwayes the same notion, or signification; For when by
the Church is understood the house of God, or place in
which the worship of God is performed, then by the Ca-
tholick Church is meant no more then the common Church,

into which all such persons as belonged to that parish in which 'twas built were wont to congregate. For where Monasteries were in use, as there were separate habitations for men, and distinct for women, so were there also Churches for each distinct: and in the Parishes, where there was no distinction of sexes as to habitation, there was a common Church which receiv'd them both, and therefore called † *Catholic*.

† Thus 'Εκκλησία Καθολική is often to be understood, especially in the latter Greeks, for the common or parochial Church. As we read in Codi-

nus de Officiis Constant. 'Ο Σακελλίς τῶν ὁνομαζομένων ἔχων ἡν Καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. And again, 'Ο Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ἔχων τῶν ὁνομαζομένων ἡν Καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν μετὰ προσερχομένης τῆς Σακελλίας. So likewise Balsamon, Λέγει Σακελλίς ὁ ἡν μοναστηρίων διοικήτης, ὡς ὁ Σακελλίς ὑποκοινητικῶς ὁ ἡν Καθολικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν φερωντίς, lib. 7. Juris Græcorum. Where appeareth a manifest distinction of the Monastick, and the Catholick Churches. Hence Alexius Patriarch of Constantinople complaineth of such as frequented the private chappells, and avoided the common Churches, describing those persons in this manner, Πατερῶν ἀκοῆς σωροποιεῖς ἢ καὶ ὁπισκοπικῶν παρρηντες, ἵνα Καθολικῶς παραιτῶμεθα, καὶ ἡν τῶν ταῦτα συνάξων κατὰ φερωνόντες, lib. 4. Juris Græcor. As the Smyrneans spake in Eusebius of Polycarpus, ἡν ὁμολογῶ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρῃ Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, lib. 4. cap. 15. So Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἢ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, in Epiphanius; and all Churches which retain the Catholick faith, are called Catholick Churches. Whence where we read in the Synod of Ariminum, οἱ τὸ αὐτὸ πάντες ἐπίσκοποι ὁμολογῶμεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ πίστις τῆς Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας γνωρίζῃ, καὶ οἱ πανταφαι φερωνόντες ἐκδηλοῖ ἡμῶν, although in Athanasius, Theodoret, and Socrates it be constantly written τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας; yet S. Hilary did certainly read it τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, for it is thus translated in his Fragments, Ut fides claresceret omnibus Ecclesiis Catholicis, & hæretici noscerentur. From whence it came to pass that in the same City Heretick, and Catholicks having their severall congregations, each of which was called the Church, the Congregation of the Catholicks was by way of distinction called the Catholick Church. Of which this was the old advice of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ἀν ποτε ἐνδημῶν ἐν πόλει, μὴ ἀπλῶς εἰσελθὲς πρὸς τὴν Κουετανόν δεῖ. καὶ ἡ δὲ λοιπὰ ἡν ἀσκήσῃ αἰεσίσεις Κουετανὴ ἵνα ἐαυτῇ ἀπὸ λεία καλεῖν ἐπιχειρῇσι. μηδὲ πῶς ἐστὶν ἀπλῶς ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ πῶς ἐστὶν ἡ Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, Catech. 18. Ego forte ingressus populo.

populosam urbem hodie cum Marcionitas, cum Apollinaricos, Cataphrygas, Novatianos, & ceteros ejusmodi comperissem, qui se Christianos vocarent, quo cognomine congregationem meae plebis agnoscerem nisi Catholica diceretur? *Pacianus* ad Sympron *Epist.* 1. Teneo postremo ipsum Catholicæ nomen, quod non sine causa ista Ecclesia sola obtinuit, ut cum omnes hæretici se Catholicos dici velint, querenti tamen peregrino alicui, ubi ad Catholicam conveniatur, nullus hæreticorum, vel Basilicam suam vel domum audeat ostendere, *S. August. con. Epist. Fundamenti*, cap. 4.

Now being these particular Churches could not be named Catholick as they were particular, in reference to this or that City in which they were congregated, it followeth that they were called Catholick by their coherence and conjunction with that Church which was † properly and originally called so; which is the Church taken in that acception which we have already delivered: That Church which was built upon the Apostles as upon the foundation, congregated by their preaching and by their baptizing, receiving continued accession, and disseminated in severall parts of the earth, containing within it numerous Congregations, all which were truly called Churches, as members of the same Church; that Church, I say, was after some time called the *Catholick Church*, that is to say, the name *Catholick* was used by the *Greeks* to signifie the whole. For being every particular congregation professing the name of Christ, was from the beginning call'd a Church, being likewise all such Congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the Church, being these two notions of the word were different, it came to passe that for distinction sake at first they called the Church, taken in the large and comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name, the *Catholick Church*.

† Nonne appellatione propria dicitur caput principale signari? *Pacianus* ibid.

* I conceive at first there was no other meaning in the

Al- word Καθολικη.

whether what the Greek language did signifie thereby, that is, tota or universa The most ancient Author which I find it in, is *Clemens Alexandrinus*, μὴν εἶναι παρὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, *Stromat. lib. 7.* But the *P. sion of Polyca- pus* written in the name of the Church of *Smyrna*, may be much ancients, in which the Originall notion seemeth most clear, Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆς Θείης ἡ παροι- κύσα.

κῦσα Σμύρναν ἢ παροικίῃ ἐν Φιλομυλίῳ, καὶ πάσις ταῖς καὶ ταῖς ἰσὺν τῆς
 αἰτίας Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίας, i.e. omnibus totius Ecclesiae paræciis,
 Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4. 15. It was otherwise called in the same place ἡ καθόλου. As A.
 pollinarius Bishop of Hierapolis, Τὴν ὃ καθόλου καὶ πᾶσι τὴν ὑπὸ τὸν ἑσπερὸν ἐκ-
 κλησίαν βλασφημῶν διδάσκοντες τὴν ἀπυθάνου πνεύματος, ἀπὸ Euseb.
 lib. 5. cap. 16. And Eusebius, Περὶ ἧς εἰς αὐξήσιν καὶ μέγεθος αἰὲ κατὰ τὰ αἰ-
 ῶνα καὶ ὡς πάντως ἔχουσα ἡ τῆς καθόλου καὶ μόνῃς ἀληθῆς ἐκκλησίας λαμπρότης,
 Hist. lib. 4. cap. 7. Καθολικὴ ἔστιν καὶ ἡ καθόλου ἡ ὅλη, the whole, generall,
 or universall.

Although this seem the first intention of those which gave the name Catholick to the Church, to signify thereby nothing else but the whole or universall Church, yet those which followed did signifie by the same that affection of the Church which floweth from the nature of it, and may be expressed by that word. At first they called the whole Church Catholick, meaning no more then the Universall Church; but having used that term some space of time, they considered how the nature of the Church was to be Universall, and in what that Universality did consist.

As far then as the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves, and as far as their expressions are agreeable with the descriptions of the Church delivered in the Scriptures, so far I conceive we may safely conclude that the Church of Christ is truly Catholick, and that the truly Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ, which must necessarily be sufficient for the explication of this affection, which we acknowledge when we say, we *believe the Catholick Church*.

The most obvious and most generall notion of this Catholicisme consisteth in the diffusiveness of the Church, grounded upon the Commission given to the builders of it, *Goe teach all nations*, whereby they and their successors were authorized and impowered to gather congregations of believers, & so to extend the borders of the Church unto the utmost parts of the earth. The Synagogue of the *Jews* especially consisted of one nation, and the publick worship of

of God was confined to one Country, *In Judah was God* Psal. 76. 1, 2.
known, and his name was great in Israel; in Salem was his
Tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Zion. He shewed Psal. 147. 19.
his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgements unto
Israel; he hath not dealt so with any nation. The Tem-
 ple was the onely place in which the Sacrifices could be of-
 fered, in which the Priests could perform their office of
 ministratation, and so under the law there was an inclo-
 sure divided from all the world beside. But God said un-
 to his Son, *I will give the heathen for thine inheritance,* Psal. 2. 8.
and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. And
 Christ commanded the Apostles, saying, *Goe ye into all* Mar. 16. 15.
the world, and preach the Gospell to every creature; that
repentance and remission of sinnes should be preached in his Luc. 24. 47.
name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. Thus the
 Church of Christ in it's primary institution was made to
 be of a diffusive nature, to spread and extend it self, from
 the City of Jerusalem, where it first began, to all the parts
 and corners of the earth. This reason did the ancient Fa-
 thers render why the Church was called * Catholick, and
 the nature of the Church is so described in the Scriptures.

* *We have be-
 fore observed
 of Arius and
 Euzoius, that
 naming the Ca-
 tholick Church*

*in their Creed they gav. withall the interpretation of it. Εἰς μίαν Καθολικὴν Ἐκ-
 κλησίαν τῷ Θεῷ, ἣν ἀπὸ πρῶτων ἕως ὁρᾶται. S. Cyril of Jerusalem gives
 this as the first importance of the word. Καθολικὴ δὲ οὕτως καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ
 πάντας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ πρῶτων γῆς ἕως ὁρᾶται, Catech. 18. Ipsa est enim
 Ecclesia Catholica: unde Καθολικὴ Græce appellatur, quod per totum orbem
 diffunditur, S. Aug. Epist. 170. Ecclesia illa est quam modo dixi unicam suam,
 hæc est unica Catholica quæ toto orbe copiose diffunditur, quæ usque ad ultimas
 gentes crescendo porrigitur, Idem Epist. 30. Si autem dubitas quod Ecclesiam
 quæ per omnes gentes numerositate copiosa dilatur, S. Scriptura commendat,
 multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem autoritate prolatis te onerabo,
 Idem c. ntra Crescon. lib. 1. cap. 33. Sancta Ecclesia ideo dicitur Catholica, pro
 eo quod universaliter per omnem mundum sit diffusa, Isidor. de Summo Bono,
 lib. 1. cap. 9.*

Secondly, they called the Church of Christ the Ca-
 tholick Church, because it teacheth all things which are
 necessary for a Christian to know, whither they be things

† This is the
second interpre-
tation delive-
red by S. Cyril,

Καὶ διὰ τὸ διδασκῆναι καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνεκλιπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων
ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δογματὰ καὶ τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων ἐπερραίων τε
καὶ ἐπιγείων, *Catech.* 18. Ecclesia Græcum nomen est, quod in Latinum vertitur
(conlocatio, propterea quod ad se omnes vocet. Catholica id est Universalis)
ideo dicitur quia per universum mundum est constituta: vel quoniam Catholi-
ca, hoc est, generalis in eadem doctrina est ad instructionem, *In Decret.*
lvo. lib. i.

* This is the
third interpre-
tation of S. Cy-
ril, Καὶ διὰ

τὸ πᾶν ἡμεῖς ἀνθρώπων εἰς εὐσεβίαν καὶ ὑποτάσσειν ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχιερέων τε
καὶ ἰδιωτῶν, *Catech.* 18.

Fourthly,
† Si reddenda Ca-
tholici vocabuli ratio est, & exprimenda de Græco interpretatione Latina, Ca-
tholicus ubique unum, vel (ut doctiores putant) obedientia omnium nuncupatur,
mandatorum scilicet Dei. Unde Apostolus, Si in omnibus obedientes estis,
& iterum, Sicut enim per inobedientiam unus peccatores constituti sunt multi, sic
per dei obedientiam unus iusti constituentur multi, Ergo qui Catholicus, idem
iustus obediens, *Pacianus Epist. I. ad Symp. on.* Acutum aliquid videris dicere
cum Catholica nomen non ex orbis totius communione interpretaris, sed ex ob-
servatione præcepto um omnium divinorum atque omnium Sacramentorum: quasi
nos etiam, si forte hinc sit appellata Catholica, quod totum veraciter teneat,
cujus veritatis nonnullæ particulæ etiam in diversis inveniuntur hæresibus, hujus
nominis testimonio nitamur ad demonstrandam Ecclesiam in omnibus gentibus, &
non promissis Dei & tam multis tamque manifestis oraculis ipsius veritatis. Sed
nempe hoc est totum, quod nobis persuadere conaris, solos remansisse Roga-
tistas, qui Catholici recte appellandi sunt ex observatione præceptorum om-
nium divinorum atque omnium Sacramentorum, *S. Aug. Vincentio, Epist. 48.*
*Indeed this Notion of the Catholick Church was urged by the Donatists as the only
notion of it in opposition to the Universality of place and communion. For when the
Catholicks answered for themselves, Quia Ecclesie toto orbe diffuse, cui testimo-*
nium

in heaven or things in earth, whither they concern the con-
dition of man in this life, or in the life to come. As the
Holy Ghost did lead the Apostles into all truth, so did
the Apostles leave all truth unto the Church, which teaching
all the same may well be called † Catholick, from the Uni-
versality of necessary and saving truths retained in it.

Thirdly, the Church hath bin thought fit to be called
Catholick in reference to the universall obedience which it
prescribeth: both in respect of the persons, obliging men
of * all conditions, and in relation to the precepts, re-
quiting the performance of † all the Evangelicall com-
mands.

Fourthly,

nam perhibet Scriptura divina, ipsi, non Donatistæ communicant, unde Catho-
lici merito & sunt & vocantur: Donatistæ autem responderunt. Non Catholi-
cum nomen ex universitate gentium, sed ex plenitudine Sacramentorum institu-
tum, *Idem Collat. 3. diei, cap. 2.*

Fourthly, the Church hath bin yet further called Catholick, by reason of all graces given in it, whereby all diseases of the soul are healed, and spirituall virtues are disseminated, all the works, and words & thoughts of men are regulated, till we become perfect men in Christ Jesus. In all these four acceptions did some of the ancient Fathers understand the Church of Christ to be Catholick, and every one of them doth certainly belong unto it. Wherefore I conclude that this Catholicisme, or second affection of the Church, consisteth generally in Universality, as embracing all sorts of persons, as to be disseminated through all nations, as comprehending all ages, as containing all necessary and saving truths, as obliging all conditions of men to all kind of obedience, as curing all diseases, and planting all graces, in the soules of men.

The necessity of believing the Holy Catholick Church, appeareth first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto eternall life. We read at the first, that *the Lord added to the Church dayly such as should be saved*; and what was then dayly done, hath bin done since continually. Christ never appointed two wayes to heaven, nor did he build a Church to save some, and make another institution. *There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved but the name of Jesus*, and that name is no otherwise given under heaven then in the Church. As none were saved from the deluge but such as were within the Ark of *Noah*, framed for their reception by the command of God; as none of the first born of *Egypt* liv'd, but such as were within those habitations whole door-posts were sprinkled with bloud by the appointment of God for their preservation; as none of the inhabitants of *Jericho* could escape the fire or

τὸ καὶ λὸγος
 καὶ πνευματι-
 καὶς παντοῖς
 χαρίσμαι, Ca-
 tech. 18.
 Act. 2. 47.
 Act. 4. 12.

† This is the fourth and last explication given by S. Cyril, Διὰ τὸ καὶ δο-
λικῶς ἱατρειύ-
ειν ἡ καὶ διεξ-
πεύειν ἅπαν
τὸ ἥν ἀμψι-
πῶν εἶδος ἡ
Διὰ τοῦ καὶ καὶ
σώματι ὅτι
πλευρῶν,
καὶ ἡ ἡδαι τε ἐν
αὐτῇ καὶ
ἐν ἡν ὀνομα-
ζομένης αἰρε-
τῆς ἐν ἡν τοῖς
τε καὶ ἡν τοῖς
καὶ πνευματι-
κοῖς παντοῖς
καὶ ἡν, Ca-
tech. 18.

Act. 2. 47.

A.R. 4. 12.

sword, but such as were within the house of *Rahab*, for whose protection a Covenant was made; so none shall ever escape the eternall wrath of God, which belong not to the Church of God. This is the congregation of those persons here on earth which shall hereafter meet in heaven. These are the vessels of the Tabernacle carried up and down, at last to be translated into, and fixed in, the Temple.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the Church of Christ which is but one, that being in it we may take care never to cast our selves, or be ejected, out of it. There is a power within the Church to cast those out which doe belong to it; for if any *neglect to hear the Church*, saith our Saviour, *let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a Publican.* By great and scandalous offences, by incorrigible misdemeanours, we may incur the censure of the Church of God, and while we are shut out by them, we stand excluded out of heaven. For our Saviour said to his Apostles, upon whom he built his Church, *Whosoever sinnes ye remitt they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sinnes ye retain they are retained.* Again, a man may not not onely passively and involuntarily be ejected, but also may by an act of his own, cast out or eject himself, not onely by plain and complete Apostacy, but by a defection from the unity of truth falling into some damnable heresie, or by an active separation, deserting all which are in communion with the Catholick Church, and falling into an irrecoverable Schism.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe the Church of Christ to be holy, least we should presume to obtain any happinesse by being of it, without that holinesse which is required in it. It is not enough that the end, institution and administration of the Church are holy & but, that there may be some reall and permanent advantage received by it, it is necessary that the persons abiding in the communion of it should be really and effectually sanctified.

ified. Without which holinesse the priviledges of the Church prove the greatest advantages, and the means of salvation neglected, tend to a punishment with aggravation. It is not onely vain but pernicious to attend at the marriage feast without a wedding garment, and it is our Saviour's description of folly to cry *Lord Lord open unto us*, while we are without oyl in our lamps. We must acknowledge a necessity of holinesse, when we confesse that Church alone which is holy can make us happy.

Fourthly, there is a necessity of believing the Catholick Church, because except a man be of that he can be of none. For being the Church which is truly Catholick containeth within it all which are truly Churches, whosoever is not of the Catholick Church, cannot be of the true Church. That Church alone which first began at *Jerusalem* on earth, will bring us to the *Jerusalem* in heaven; and that alone began there which alwayes embraceth the *faith once delivered to the Saints*. Whatsoever Church pretendeth to a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdome, and whatsoever is so new in none. So necessary it is to believe the *holy Catholick Church*.

Having thus far explicated the first part of this Article, I conceive every person sufficiently furnished with means of instruction what they ought to intend when they professe to believe the *Holy Catholick Church*. For thereby every one is understood to declare thus much, I am fully perswaded, and make a free confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that Christ by the preaching of the Apostles, did gather unto himself a Church consisting of thousands of believing persons, and numerous congregations, to which he dayly added such as should be saved, and will successively dayly adde unto the same untill the end of the world: so that by the virtue of his allsufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath bin hitherto, and now is, and hereafter shall be so long as the

Sun and Moon endure, a Church of Christ one and the same. This Church I believe in generall holy in respect of the Author, end, institution and administration of it; particularly in the members here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly, holy. I look upon this Church not like that of the *Jews* limited to one people, confined to one nation, but by the appointment and command of Christ and by the efficacy of his assisting power to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with graces necessary to make our persons acceptable, and our actions well pleasing in the sight of God. And thus *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church.*

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

† These words
Communio-
nem Sancto-
rum, were not
in the Aquila-
lian Creed ex-
pounded by Ruf-
inus; they were
not mentioned
by him as being
either in the O-

rientall or the Roman Creed. They were not in the African Creed expounded by Saint Austin De Fide & Symbolo, not in the Creed delivered by Maximus Taurinensis; not in any of the Sermons of Chrysologus; not in any of the four Books de Symbolo ad Catechumenos attributed to S. Austin; not in the 119. Sermon under his name De Tempore, Cum dixerimus Sanctam Ecclesiam, adjungamus Remissionem peccatorum. They are not in the Greek Creed in Sir Robert Cotton's Library, nor in the old

THIS part of the Article beareth something a † latter date then any of the rest, but yet is no way inferiour to the other in relation to the certainty of the truth thereof. And the late admission of it into the Creed will be thus far advantageous, that thereby we may be the better assured of the true intent of it as it is placed in the Creed. For it will be no way fit to give any other explication of these words as the sense of the Creed, than what was then understood by the Church of God, when they were first inserted.

old Latine Creed in the Oxford Library, not in that produced by Elipandus. We find them not in the old Greek Creeds, not in that of Eusebius given in to the Council of Nice, not in that of Marcellus delivered to the Bishop of Rome, not in that of Arius and Euzoius presented to Constantine, not in either of the Creeds preserved in the Ancoratus of Epiphanius, not in the Jerusalem Creed expounded by S. Cyril, not in that of the Council of Constantinople, not in that of Charisius given in to the Ephesine Council, nor in either of the Expositions under the name of S. Chrysostome. It was therefore of a latter date, and is found in the Latine and Greek Copy in Bennet Colledge Library, and is expressed and expounded in the 115. and 181. Sermon to Tempore, attributed to S. Austin.

If we look upon the first institution of the Church, and the originall condition of those persons which received the Gospell, how they were all together, and had all things common; how they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need, how S. Paul urged an equality, that the abundance of some might supply the want of others, as it was written, He that had gather'd much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack: we might well conceive that the communion, (which word might be taken for communication) of the Saints, may signifie the great * charity, bounty and community, among the people of God. A^ct. 2. 44, 45.
2 Cor. 8. 14, 15.

But being that community precisely taken, was not of eternall obligation, nor actually long continued in the Church, being I conceive this Article doth not wholly look upon that which is already past, and especially being I think neither that custome, nor that notion was then generally received in the Church when this communion of Saints was first inserted, I shall therefore endeavour to shew that communion which the Saints have both according to the Fathers who have delivered it, and according to the Scriptures from whence they derived it.

Now all communion being between such as are some way different and distinct, the communion of the Saints may either be conceived between them and others, or between themselves; between them and others as differing from them either in their nature or their sanctity, between

* As Grotius upon that place of the Corinthians observes, *Spe^{ci}at & huc ea quam in Symbolo profiteremur Sanctorum communionem.*

themselves, as distinct in person onely, or condition also. Wherefore if we can first understand who or what kind of persons these are which are called *Saints*, with whom beside themselves, & how among themselves, in this relation as they are the Saints, they have communion, and lastly in what the nature of that communion in each respect consisteth; I know not what can be thought wanting to the perfect explication of *the Communion of Saints*.

That we may understand what Communion the Saints have with others, it will be necessary first to consider what it is to be a Saint, in what the true nature of Saintship doth consist, by what the Saints are distinguished from others. Again, that we may understand what Communion the Saints have with or among themselves, it will be further necessary to consider who are those persons to which that title doth belong, what are the various conditions of them, that we may be able to comprehend all such as are true Saints, and thence conclude the communion between them all.

† Κοινωνία ἁγίων may be as well understood in the N. uter as the Masculine, as Exod. 28. 38. Ἐξαρῇ Ἀαρὼν τὰ ἁμώστηματα ἑῷ ἁγίῳ, that

Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things. So Levit 5. 1. Καὶ ἁμάρτη ἀκυσίως ἀπὸ ἑῷ ἁγίῳ Κυεῖν. 22. 2. Καὶ προσέτι ἀπὸ ἑῷ ἁγίῳ ἑῷ ὕδρ' Ἰσραήλ. 1 Chron 24. 5. ἀρχοντες ἑῷ ἁγίῳ, the Governours of the Sanctuary, of which notion afterwards.

* This is one of the common names of God in the Old Testament, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, which is also sometimes translated plurally by the LXX. as Ef. 41. 16. Ἰσραὴλ ὡς τοῖς ἁγίοις Ἰσραὴλ. Jer. 51. 5. מִקְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, ἀπὸ ἁγίῳ Ἰσραὴλ; and if it were so taken, then κοινωνία ἑῷ ἁγίῳ, would be the communion of God, as τὸ ἁγίον Πνεῦμα.

in it.

in it. Thirdly, I take it further for granted that the word in this Article is not taken in the Originall of the Creed, as it is often taken in the Translation of the Old Testament, for the † Sanctuary, as if the communion were nothing else but a right of communicating or participating of the holy things of God. Lastly, I take it also for granted that although the blessed and holy Angels are sometimes called in the Scriptures by the name of * Saints, yet they are not those Saints who are said to have the communion, though the Saints have communion with them.

† Τα ἅγια is frequently used in the Scriptures for the Sanctuary; and then κοινωνία ἁγίων might be taken for the communion in

all those things which belonged to the worship of God, as ἀκοινωνήτος was a man excluded from all such communion.

* The Angels are not onely called holy in the Scriptures by way of addition or epithite, as πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι ἅγιοι, Mat. 25. 31. μετα τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων, Mar. 8. 38. Luc. 9. 26. ἐξημερίδην ἐπὶ ἀγγέλων ἁγίων, Act. 10. 22. ἐνώπιον τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, Rev. 14. 10. But also the ἅγιοι, holy ones, or Saints, taken substantively or singly signifie sometimes the Angels, as Deut. 32. 2. קדשׁ מרבב תחתיו, he came with ten thousands of Saints, which the Jerusalem Targum renders וטמיה ריבון מלאכין קדישׁין, and with him ten thousands of holy Angels; and Jonathan, וטמיה רבן רבון מלאכין קדישׁין, and with him myriads of myriads of holy Angels. And although the LXX. keep the Hebrew קדשׁ, yet they understood the Angels in that place; Κυρίως Κόδης, ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. So Job 5. 1. To which of the Saints wilt thou turn? οἱ τίνα ἀγγέλων ἁγίων ὀψή, LXX. Thus in the vision of Daniel, he heard one Saint speaking, and another Saint said unto that certain Saint which spake, Dan. 8. 13. So Zach. 14. 5. And the Lord my God shall come, and all the Saints with thee. And thus it may very well be understood in the New Test. 1 Theff. 3. 13. ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ, in correspondence to that 2 Theff. 1. 7. ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' ἐναντίας μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμει αὐτοῦ. These are the μυριάδες ἁγίων in S. Jude קדשׁ מרבב, the myriads of Angels; and thus κοινωνία ἁγίων should be the communion of the Angels.

For this part of the Article hath a manifest relation to the former, in which we professe to believe the Holy Church; which Church is therefore holy because those persons are such, or ought to be, which are within it, the Church it self being nothing else but a Collection of such persons. To that confession is added this Communion; but because though the Church be holy, yet every person

con-

contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the Article which concerneth those who are truly such. There is therefore no doubt but the Saints mentioned here, are members of the Church of Christ as we have described it, built upon the Apostles, laid upon the foundation of their doctrine, who doe not onely professe the Gospel, but also are sanctified thereby.

The onely question then remaining is, in what their sanctity or Saintship doth consist, and, (because though they which are believers since our Saviours death be truly and more highly sanctified, yet such as lived before and under the Law, the Patriarchs, the Prophets and the servants of God were also called, and were truly named the Saints of God) who were the persons which are capable of that denomination.

Now being God himself hath given a rule unto his people, which is both in the nature of a precept and of a pattern. *Be ye holy as I the Lord your God am holy: be ye holy*, there's the command, as *the Lord your God is holy*, there's the rule; being it is impossible that we should have the same sanctity which is in God, it will be necessary to declare what is this holiness which maketh men to be accounted holy ones, and to be called *Saints*.

The true notion of Saints is expressed by *Moses* both as to the subject, and the affection or qualification of it; for
 Exod. 22. 31. *they are called by him men of holiness*; such are the persons understood in this Article, which is the communion of men of holiness. Now holiness in the first acception of it signifieth separation, and that with the relation of a double term, of one from which the separation is made, of the other to which that which is separated is applied. Those things which were counted holy under the Law were separated from common use, & applied to the service of God, & their sanctity was nothing else but that separation from and to those termes, from an use and exercise profane and common, to an use and exercise peculiar and divine.

vine. Thus all such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of Saints. The Penmen of the Old Testament doe often speak of the people of *Israel* as of an holy nation, and God doth speak unto them as to a people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that nation were rebellious to him which called them, and voyd of all true inherent and actuall sanctity, yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to that separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament writing to such as were called, and had received, and were baptized, in the faith, give unto them all the name of Saints, as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being Baptisme is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to presume of the good effect, therefore all such as have bin received into the Church, may be in some sense called holy.

But because there is more then an outward vocation, and a charitable presumption, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not onely by an extrinsecall denomination, but by a reall and internall affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the Gospel of Christ, by which alone, ever since the Church of Christ was founded, any man can become a Saint. Now by the tenure of the Gospel we shall find that those are truly and properly

V u t u Saints,

1 Cor. 1. 2.

1 Joh. 5. 1.

Aa. 15. 9.

1 Cor. 6. 11.

Eph. 1. 13.

1 Pet. 1. 15.

2 Pet. 1. 8.

Saints, which are *sanctified in Christ Jesus*; first, in respect of their holy faith, by which they are regenerated; for *whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*; by which they are purged, God himself *purifying their hearts by faith*, whereby they are washed, *sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, in whom also after that they believe, they are sealed with the holy Spirit of promise*; secondly, in respect of their conversation: For *as he which hath called them is holy, so are they holy in all manner of conversation*; adding to their faith *virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience brotherly kindnesse, and to brotherly kindnesse charity, that they may neither be barren nor unfruitfull in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Such persons then as are called by a holy calling, and not disobedient to it, such as are endued with a holy faith, and purified thereby, such as are sanctified by the holy Spirit of God, and by virtue thereof do lead a holy life, *perfecting holinesse in the fear of God*, such persons, I say, are really and truly Saints, and being of the Church of Christ, (as all such now must of necessity be) are the proper subject of this part of the Article, *the communion of Saints*, as it is added to the former, *the holy Catholick Church*.

1 Cor. 14. 33.

Psal. 89. 5, 7.

149. 1. בקהל

:קדשׁים Lxx.

ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ

ἀγίων, בְּסֵדֶךָ

:קדשׁים ἐν

βελῆ ἀγίων,

Vulg. Lat. in

Ecclesia & in consilio sanctorum.

Deut. 33. 3.

Mat. 27. 52.

Psal. 106. 16.

Quis ignorat sub altera dispensatione Dei omnes retro Sanctos ejusdem fuisse me-

riti cujus nunc Christiani sunt? S. Hieron. adv. Jovinian.

Now as these are the Saints of the Church of Christ, from whence they were called *the Churches of the Saints*; so there was never any Church of God but there were such persons in it as were Saints; we read in the *Psalms* of *the congregation and the assembly of the Saints*; and *Moses* assured the people of *Israel*, that *all the Saints of God* were in his hand; we read in the *Prophets* of *the Saints of the most High*, and at our Saviours death *the bodies of such Saints which slept arose*. Where again we may ob-

serve:

serve that they were Saints while their bodies were in the grave; as *Aaron* in the time of *David* kept the name of *the Saint of the Lord*. Such as are holy in their lives do not loose their sanctity but improve it at their deaths, nor can they loose the honour of that appellation, while that which gives it doth acquire perfection.

Hence growes that necessary distinction of the Saints on earth, and the Saints in heaven; the first belonging to the Militant, the second to the Triumphant Church. Of the first the Prophet *David* speaketh expressly, *Thou art my Lord, my goodnesse extendeth not to thee, but to the Saints that are in the earth*: of these do we read in the *Acts* of the Apostles, to these did *S. Paul* direct his Epistles. Of the second doth the Apostle make that question, *Do ye not know that the Saints shall judge the world?* And all those which were spoken of as Saints then in earth, if truly such and departed so, are now, and shall for ever continue, Saints in heaven.

Plal. 16. 2, 3.

1 Corinth. 6. 2.

Having thus declared what is the sanctity required to make a Saint, that is, a man of holinesse; having also distinguished the Saints before, and under the Gospel, (which difference is onely observable as to this exposition of the Creed,) and again distinguishing the same Saints while they live here with men on earth, and when after death they live with God in heaven; having also shewed that of all these, those Saints are here particularly understood which in all ages lived in the Church of Christ; we may now properly descend to the next consideration, which is, who are those persons with whom those Saints have this Communion, and in what the Communion which they have consists.

First then, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ, have communion with God the Father; for the Apostles did therefore write that they to whom they wrote might have communion with them, (*that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also* 1 Joh. 1. 3.)

Vuuu 2 may

κοινωνία μετὰ
τῆς Πατρὸς.

Jac. 2. 23.

1 Joh. 3. 1.

2 Pet. 14. *ἑταίροι
κοινωνοὶ φύ-
σεως.*

1 Joh. 1. 3.

2 John 9.

Joh. 17. 20,
21, 23.

Joh. 1. 16.
Philip, 3. 10.

may have fellowship with us, saith S. John,) and did at the same time declare that their communion was with the Father. Wherefore being all the Saints of God under the Gospel receiving the doctrine of the Apostles have communion with them; being the communion of the Apostles was the communion with the Father, it followeth that all the Saints of God under the Gospel have a communion with God the Father. As we are the branches of the Vine, so the Father is the husbandman; and thus the Saints partake of his care and inspection, As Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God, so all which are heirs of the faith of Abraham are made partakers of the same relation. Nor are we only friends, but also sonnes; for behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sonnes of God. Thus must we acknowledge that the Saints of God have communion with the Father, because by the great and precious promises given unto them, they become partakers of the divine nature.

Secondly, the Saints of God living in the Church of God have communion with the Son of God: for as the Apostle said, our communion is with the Father and the Son; and this connexion is infallible, because he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son; and our Saviour prayed for all such as should believe on him through the word of the Apostles, that they might be one, as the Father is one in him and he in the Father, that they also may be one in both. I in them, saith Christ, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. This communion of the Saints with the Son of God is, as most evident, so most remarkable. He hath taken unto him our nature and infirmities; he hath taken upon him our finnes, and the curse due unto them; while we all have received of his fulnesse, grace for grace; and are all called to the fellowship of his sufferings that we may be

con-

conformable to his death. What is the fellowship of brethren and coheirs, of the Bridegroom and the Sponse: what is the communion of members with the head, of branches with the Vine, that is the communion of Saints with Christ. For God hath called unto us the fellowship of his Son *Jesus Christ our Lord.* 1 Cor. 1. 9.
κοινωνία τοῦ
Ἰη.

Thirdly, the Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the Holy Ghost; and the Apostle hath two wayes assured us of the truth thereof, one Rhetorically, by a seeming doubt, *if there be any fellowship of the Spirit*; the other devoutly, praying for it, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, & the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.* The Saints are therefore such, because they partake of the Holy Ghost, for they are therefore holy because they are sanctified, and it is the Spirit alone which sanctifieth. Beside, the communion with the Father and the Son is wrought by the communication of the Spirit; for hereby do we become the Sons of God, in that we have received the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry *Abba father*; and thereby doe we become coheirs with Christ, in that *because we are sons God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba Father*; so that we are no more servants but sons, and if sons then heirs of God through Christ. This is the communion which the Saints enjoy with the three persons of the blessed Trinity: this is the heavenly fellowship represented unto entertaining *Abraham*, when the Lord appeared to him, and three men stood by him; for our Saviour hath made us this most precious promise, *If any man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, & we will come unto him & make our abode with him.* Here is the soul of man made the habitation of God the Father and of God the Son, & the presence of the Spirit cannot be wanting where those two are inhabiting; for if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. The Spirit therefore with the Father and the Son inhabiteth Philip. 2. 1.
κοινωνία Πνεύ-
ματος.
2 Cor. 13. 14.

Gal. 4. 6, 7.

Gen. 18. 1, 2.

Joh. 14. 23.

Rom. 8. 9.

1 Cor. 3. 16.

in the Saints ; for *know ye not*, saith the Apostle, *that ye are the Temple of God , and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you ?*

Heb. 1. 14.

Luc. 15. 10.

Mat. 18. 10.

Fourthly , the Saints of God in the Church of Christ have communion with the holy Angels. They which did foretell the birth of *John* the forerunner of Christ , they which did annunciate unto the blessed Virgin the conception of the Saviour of the world , they which sung a glorious hymn at the Nativity of the Son of God , they which carried the soul of *Lazarus* into *Abrahams* bosome , they which appeared unto Christ from heaven in his agonie to strengthen him , they which opened the prison doors and brought the Apostles forth , they which at the end of the world shall sever the wicked from among the just , and gather together the elect of God , certainly they have a constant and perpetuall relation to the children of God. Nay, *are they not all ministring spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation ?* They have a particular sense of our condition, for Christ hath assured us that *there is joy in the presence of the Angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.* And upon this relation the Angels, which are all the Angels of God , are yet called the Angels of men , according to the admonition of Christ , *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you , That in heaven their Angels doe alwayes bekeold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

Thus far have we considered *the communion of Saints* with such as are distinguished from them by nature as they are men ; the fellowship which they have in heaven with God and his holy Angels while they are on earth. Our next consideration will be what is the communion which they have with those who are of the same nature , but not partakers of the same holinesse with them.

Fifthly therefore, the Saints of God while they are of the Church of Christ on earth have some kind of communion with those men which are not truly Saints. There were not
hypo-

hypocrites among the *Jewes* alone, but in the Church of Christ many cry Lord Lord, whom he knoweth not. The tares have the priviledge of the field, as well as the wheat, and the bad fish of the net, as well as to good. The Saints have communion with hypocrites in all things with which the distinction of a Saint and Hypocrite can consist. They communicate in the same water, both baptized alike; they communicate in the same Creed, both make the same profession of faith, both agree in the same principles of religion; they communicate in the same word, both hear the same doctrine preach'd; they communicate at the same table, both eat the same bread and drink the wine, which Christ hath appointed to be received; but the Hypocrite doth not communicate with the Saint in the same saving grace, in the same true faith working by love, and in the same renovation of mind and spirit, for then he were not an hypocrite but a Saint: a Saint doth not communicate with the hypocrite in the same sinnes, in the same unfruitfulnesse under the means of grace, in the same false pretence and empty form of godlinesse, for then he were not a Saint but an Hypocrite. Thus the Saints may communicate with the wicked, so they communicate not with their wickednesse, and may have fellowship with sinners so they have no fellowship with that which makes them such, that is their sinnes. The Apostles command runneth thus, *Have no fellowship with the unfruitfull works of darknesse*, and again, *Be not partaker of other mens sinnes*, and a voice from heaven spake concerning Babylon, *Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sinnes*. To communicate with sin is sin, but to communicate with a sinner in that which is not sin, can be no sin, because the one defileth, and the other cannot.

Eph. 5. 11. Μὴ
κοινωνεῖ-
τε τοῖς ἔργοις.
1 Tim. 5. 22. Μὴ
κοινωνεῖς
τοῖς ἀμάρ-
τιαις.
Rev. 18. 4.
Ὑποκούετε τῇ
φωνῇ τοῦ
κυρίου λέγοντος·

Duobus modis non te maculat malus, si ei non consentias, & si redarguas. Communicatur enim quando factio ejus consortium voluntatis vel approbationis adjungitur. Hoc ergo admonens Apostolus ait, Nolite communicare operibus in-
fructuosis senebrarum, magis autem & redarguite, S. Aug. de Verbis Dom. Serm. 18.

Having

Having thus considered those which differ among the Saints of God ; first, in respect of their humanity, as they are men ; secondly, in reference to their sanctity, as they are men of holiness : we are now to consider such as differ either onely in person, as the Saints alive, or in present condition also, as the Saints departed.

1 Joh. 1. 7. και
ωνια μετ' αλ-
λων.

Coloss. 2. 19.

Sixtly therefore, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ have communion with all the Saints living in the same Church. *If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another* : we all have benefit of the same ordinances, all partake of the same promises, all endued with the graces of the same spirit, all united with the same mutuall love and affection, keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, all engrafted into the same stock, and so receiving life from the same root, all *holding* the same head, *from which all the body by joynts and bands having nourishment ministred and knit together, encreaseth with the encrease of God.* For in the philosophy of the Apostle the nerves are not onely the instruments of motion and sensation, but of nutrition also ; so that every member receiveth nourishment by their intervention from the head : and being the head of the body is Christ, and all the Saints are members of that body, they all partake of the same nourishment, and so have all communion among themselves.

† This is that part of the Communion of Saints which those of the Ancients especially insisted upon, who first took notice of it in the Creed. Sanctorum Communionem, id est, cum illis Sanctis qui in hac quam suscepimus fide defuncti sunt societate & spei communione teneamur, Serm. 181. de Tempo. c.

Lastly, the Saints of God living in the Church of Christ, are in communion with all the Saints † departed out of this life and admitted to the presence of God. *Jerusalem* sometimes is taken for the Church on earth, sometimes for that part of the Church which is in heaven, to shew that as both are represented by one, so both are but one City of God. Wherefore thus doth the Apostle speak to such as are called to the Christian faith, *Ye are come*

unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and an innumerable company of Angels, to the generall assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, Heb. 12, 22, 23; and to the Spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediatour of the new covenant. Indeed, the Communion of the Saints in the Church of Christ with those which are departed is demonstrated by their communion with the Saints alive. For if I have communion with a Saint of God, as such, while he liveth here, I must still have communion with him when he is departed hence; because the foundation of that communion cannot be removed by death. The mysticall union between Christ and his Church, the spirituall conjunction of the members to the head, is the true foundation of that communion which one member hath with another, all the members living and encreasing by the same influence which they receive from him. But death, which is nothing else but the separation of the soul from the body, maketh no separation in the mysticall union, no breach of the spirituall conjunction, and consequently, there must continue the same communion, because there remaineth the same foundation. Indeed, the Saint departed, before his death had some communion with the hypocrite, as hearing the word, professing the faith, receiving the Sacraments together; which being in things onely externall, as they were common to them both, and all such externall actions ceasing in the person dead, the hypocrite remaining looseth all communion with the Saint departing, and the Saints surviving cease to have further fellowship with the hypocrite dying. But being the true and unfeigned holinesse of man wrought by the powerfull influence of the Spirit of God not onely remaineth, but also is improved after death; being the correspondence of the internall holinesse was the true communion between their persons in their life, they cannot be said to be divided by death, which had no power

X x x x

over

over that sanctity by which they were first conjoyed,

This Communion of the Saints in heaven and earth upon the mysticall union of Christ, their head being fundamentall and internall, what acts or externall operations it produceth is not so certain. That we communicate with them in hope of that happinesse which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as an earnest, and so a part of their felicity is certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth particularly consider'd, or what we ought to perform in reference to them in heaven, beside a reverentiall respect, and study of imitation, is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity. They which first found this part of the Article in the Creed, and delivered their exposition unto us, have made no greater enlargement of this Communion, as to the Saints of heaven, then the society of hope, esteem and imitation on our side, of desires and supplications on their side: and what is now taught by the Church of Rome, is, as unwarrantable, so a novitious interpretation.

* We have already produced the words of the 181. Sermon de Tempore, concerning hope.

The
In the same we find also that of imitation, Si igitur cum Sanctis in æterna vita communionem habere volumus, de imitatione eorum cogitemus. Debent enim in nobis aliquid recognoscere de suis virtutibus, ut pro nobis dignentur Domino supplicare, *ibid.* Hæc sunt vestigia quæ nobis Sancti quoque revertentes in patriam nobis reliquerant, ut illorum semitis inhaerentes sequeremur ad gaudia, *ib.* Beside this imitation, he addeth their desires and care for us below. Cur non properamus & currimus ut patriam nostram videre possimus? Magnus illic charorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrum, filiorum, frequens nos & copiosa turba desiderat jam de sua incolumitate securo, adhuc de nostra salute sollicita, *ib.* Of the Venerable esteem we ought to have of them, speaks Eusebius Gallicanus, Credamus & Sanctorum communionem, sed Sanctos non tam pro Dei parte, quam pro Dei honore veneremur. And again, Digne nobis venerandi sunt dum Dei cultum, & futuræ vitæ desiderium contempni mortis insinuant. Thus far anciently they were expounded this Article: but the late Exposition of the Church of Rome: annexeth thus, Non solum Ecclesia quæ est in terris communicat bona sua cum omnibus membris sibi conjunctis, sed etiam communicat suffragia Ecclesiæ quæ est in Purgatorio, & Ecclesia quæ est in cælis communicat orationes, & merita sua cum Ecclesia quæ est in terris, Bellarmin. in Symbolum. Where the communication of the Suffrages of the Saints alive to the Church in Purgatory, and the communica-

tion of the merits of the Saints in heaven to the Saints on earth, are novel expositions of this Article, not so much as acknowledged by Thomas Aquinas in his Explication of the Creed, much lesse to be found in any of the Ancient Expositors of it.

The necessity of the belief of this Communion of Saints appeareth, first, in that it is proper to excite and encourage us to holinesse of life. *If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.* 1 Joh. I. 6, 7. But if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darknesse, we lye, and do not the truth. For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousnesse? and what communion hath light with darknesse? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? When Christ sent S. Paul to the Gentiles, it was to open their eyes, and to turn them from darknesse to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Christ. Act. 26. 18. Except we be turned from darknesse, except we be taken out of the power of Satan, which is the dominion of sin, we cannot receive the inheritance among them which are sanctified, we cannot be thought meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the Saints in light. Col. I. 12. Indeed there can be no communion where there is no similitude, no fellowship with God without some sanctity; because his nature is infinitely holy, and his actions are not subject to the least iniquity.

Secondly, the belief of the Communion of Saints is necessary to stir us up to a proportionate gratitude unto God, and an humble and cheerfull acknowledgement of so great a benefit. We cannot but acknowledge that they are exceeding great and precious promises, by which we become partakers of the divine nature. What am I? said David, 1 Sam. 18. 18. and what is my life that I should be son in law to the King? What are we the sons of men, what are they which are called to be Saints, that they should have fellowship with God the Father? S. Philip the Apostle said unto our Saviour, Lord, shew us the Father and it sufficeth; where Joh. 14. 8.

as he hath not onely shewn us , but come unto us with the Father , and dwelt within us by his holy Spirit ; he hath called us to the fellowship of the Angels and Archangels, of the Cherubins and Seraphins , to the glorious company of the Apostles, to the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, to the noble Army of Martyrs , to the holy Church militant in earth, and triumphant in heaven.

Thirdly , the belief of *the Communion of Saints* is necessary to inflame our hearts with an ardent affection towards those which live , and a reverent respect towards those which are departed and are now with God. Nearness of relation requireth affection, and that man is unnatural who loveth not those persons which nature hath more immediately conjoynd to him. Now no conjunction naturall can be compared with that which is spirituall , no temporall relation with that which is eternall. It similitude of shape and feature will create a kindnesse , if congruity of manners and disposition will conjoyn affections ; what should be the mutuall love of those who have the image of the same God renewed within them , of those who are endued with the gracious influences of the same Spirit ? And if all the Saints of God living in communion of the Church deserve the best of our affections here on earth : certainly when they are dissolved and with Christ, when they have bin blessed with a sight of God , and rewarded with a Crown of glory, they may challenge some respect from us , who are here to wait upon the will of God expecting when such a happy change shall come.

To conclude , every one may learn from hence what he is to understand by this part of the Article , in which he professeth to believe *the Communion of Saints* ; for thereby he is conceived to expresse thus much ; I am fully perswaded of this as of a necessary and infallible truth , that such persons as are truly sanctified in the Church of Christ, while they live among the crooked generations of men , and struggle with all the miseries of this world , have fellowship

lowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, as dwelling with them, and taking up their habitations in them: that they partake of the care and kindnesse of the blessed Angels, who take delight in the ministration for their benefit: that beside the external fellowship which they have in the Word and Sacraments with all the members of the Church, they have an intimate union and conjunction with all the Saints on earth as the living members of Christ; nor is this union separated by the death of any, but as Christ in whome they live, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, so have they fellowship with all the Saints which from the death of *Abel* have ever departed in the true faith and fear of God, and now enjoy the presence of the Father, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. And thus I believe *the Communion of Saints*.

ARTICLE X.

THE FORGIVENESSE OF SINS.

* Therefore
 Carolus Ma-
 gnus in his Ca-
 p tular 1.3. c.6.
 inveighs against
 Basilius the Bi-
 shop of Ancyra,
 because in his
 Confession of

Faith which he delivered in the second Council of Nice (Aet. 1.) he omitted the Remission of sins, which the Apostles in so short a Compendium as the Creed would not omit. Hanc Apostoli in conlatione fidei, quam ab invicem discessuri quasi quandam credulitatis & prædicationis normam statuerunt, post confessionem Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti posuisse perhibentur; & in tanti verbi brevitate, de quo per Prophetam dictum est, Verbum abbreviatum faciet Dominus super terram, hanc ponere minime distulerunt, quia sine hac fidei sinceritatem integram esse minime perspexerunt. Nec cohibuit eos ab ejus professione illius Symboli brevis, quam exposcebat sacræ fidei integritas, tantique doni veneranda sublimitas.

† Concordant autem Angeli nobiscum etiam tunc cum remittuntur nostra peccata. Ideo post commemorationem S. Ecclesiæ in ordine Confessionis ponitur Remissio peccatorum: per hanc enim stat Ecclesiæ quæ in terris est, per hanc non perit, quod perierat & inventum est, S. Aug. Enchirid. cap. 64. And to this purpose it is that in his book de agone Christiano, passing from one Article to another with his generall transition; after that of the Church, he proceedeth with these words, Nec eos audiamus qui negant Ecclesiæ Dei omnia peccata posse dimittere, cap. 31. So it sheweth also in Venantius Fortunatus, and in such other Creeds as want that part of the former Article of the Communion of Saints.

† Sanctam Ecclesiæ teneat . . . in qua & remissio peccatorum & carnis resurrectio prædicabatur, Ruffin. in Symb. Sed neque de ipsis criminibus quamlibet magnis remittendis in S. Ecclesiæ desperanda est misericordia, S. Aug. Enchir. cap. 65. In remissionem peccatorum Hæc in Ecclesiæ si non esset, nulla spes esset. Remissio peccatorum si in Ecclesiæ non esset, nulla futuræ vitæ & liberationis æternæ spes esset. Gratias agimus Deo, qui Ecclesiæ suæ dedit hoc donum, Author Homil. 119. de Tempore.

Ghost, in whose name baptism was administred; they propounded unto them *the Holy Church*, into which by baptism they were to be admitted, and *the forgiveness of sins*, which by the same baptism was to be obtained; and † *These are the words of the* therefore in some Creeds it was particularly express'd, † *Constantino-* believe one baptism for the forgiveness of sins. *politan Creed,*

βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμάρτιων. Before which Epiphanius in his lesser Creed, Ὁμολογῶ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμάρτιων, in the Larger. Πιστεύω εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς βάπτισμα μετανοίας, in Ancora- to. S. Cyril both these together, Εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμάρτιων.

Looking thus upon this Article, with this relation, we find the sense of it must be this, that we believe *forgiveness of sins* is to be obtained in the Church of Christ. For the Explication whereof it will be necessary; first, to declare what is the nature of Remission of sins, in what that action doth consist: secondly, to shew how so great a Priviledge is propounded in the Church, and how it may be procured by the members of the Church. That we may understand the notion of *forgiveness of sins*, three Considerations are required; first, what is the nature of Sin, which is to be forgiven: secondly, what is the guilt or obligation of Sin, which wanteth forgiveness; thirdly, what is the remission it self, or the loosing of that obligation.

As the power of Sin is revealed onely in the Scriptures, so the nature of it is best understood from thence. And though the writings of the Apostles give us few definitions, yet we may find even in them a proper definition of Sin. *Whoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law*, saith S. John, and then rendreth this reason of that universall assertion, *for sin is the transgression of the law*. Which is an Argument drawn from the Definition of Sin; for he saith not, *Every sin is the transgression of the law*, which had bin necessary, if he had spoken by way of proposition onely, to have proved the Universality of his Assertion, but.

1 Joh. 3. 4.

4 Rom. 4. 15.

but produceth it indefinitely, *Sin is the transgression of the law*, which is sufficient speaking it by way of † definition. And it is elsewhere most evident that every sin is something prohibited by some law, and deviating from the same. For the Apostle affirming that *a the law worketh wrath*, that is, a punishment from God, giveth this as a reason or proof of his affirmation, *for where no law is there is no transgression*. The law of God is the rule of the actions of men, and any aberration from that rule is * sin: the law of God is pure, and whatsoever is contrary to that law is impure. Whatsoever therefore is done by man, or is in man having any contrariety or opposition to the law of God, is sin. Every action, every word, every thought against the law is a sin of commission, as it is terminated to an object dissonant from, and contrary unto the prohibition of the Law, or a negative precept. Every omission of a duty required of us is a sin, as being contrary to the commanding part of the law, or an affirmative precept. Every evil habit contracted in the soul of man by actions committed against the law of God, is a sinne constituting a man truly a sinner, even then when he actually sinneth not. Any corruption and inclination in the soul to doe that which God forbid-eth, and to omit that which God commandeth, howsoever such corruption and evil inclination came into that

† The manner of the Apostles speech is also to be observ'd having an Article pr fixed

both to the subject and the predicate, as if thereby he would make the proposition convertible, as all definitions ought to be, *Ἡ ἀνομία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποκλίνα*.

* Quid est peccatum nisi prævaricatio legis divinæ & cœlestium inobedientia peccatorum? S. Ambros. de Paradiso, cap. 8. Peccatum est factum vel dictum vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem, S. Aug. contra Faustum, l. 22. c. 27. Quid verum est nisi & Dominum dare præcepta, & animas liberæ esse voluntatis, & malum naturam non esse, sed esse aversionem à Dei præceptis? Idem de Fide contra Manich. cap. 10. Neque negandum est hoc Deum jubere, ita nos in facienda justitia esse debere perfectos ut nullum habeamus omnino peccatum: nam neque peccatum erit, si quid erit, si non divinitus jubeatur ut non sit, Idem de Pec. Meritis, & Rem. lib. 2. cap. 16.

soul, whither by an act of his own will, or by an act of the will of another, is a sin, as being something dissonant and repugnant to the Law of God. And this I conceive sufficient to declare the Nature of Sin.

The second particular to be considered is the Obligation of Sin, which must be presupposed to the solution or remission of it. Now every sin doth cause a guilt, and every sinner, by being so, becomes a guilty person: which guilt consisteth in a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable to the iniquity of the Sin. It is the nature of Lawes in generall to be attended with these two, punishments, and rewards, the one propounded for the observation of them, the other threatned upon the deviation from them. And although there were no threats or penall denunciations accompanying the Lawes of God, yet the transgression of them would neverthelesse make the person transgressing worthy of, and liable unto, whatsoever punishment can in justice be inflicted for that sin committed. Sins of commission passe away in the acting or performing of them, so that he which acteth against a negative precept, after the act is pass'd, cannot properly be said to sin. Sins of omission, when the time is pass'd in which the affirmative precept did oblige unto performance, passe away: so that he which did then omit his duty when it was required, and in omitting sinn'd, after that time cannot be truly said to sin. But though the sin it self doe passe away together with the time in which it was committed, yet the guilt thereof doth never passe which by committing was contracted. He which but once committeth adultery, at that one time sinneth, and at no time after can be said to commit that sin, but the guilt of that sin remaineth on him still, and he may be for ever said to be guilty of adultery, because he is for ever subject to the wrath of God, & obliged to suffer the punishment due unto adultery.

† This obligation unto punishment, remaining after the act of sin, is that Peccati Reatus, of which the Schol., and before them the Fathers spake. The nature of

This Reatus is

excellently declared by S. Austin delivering the distinction between actual and original sin. In eis qui regenerantur in Christo cum remissionem accipiunt prorsus

Y y y

omnium

omnium peccatorum, utique necesse est ut reatus etiam hujus licet adhuc manentis Concupiscentiæ remittatur, ut in peccatum non imputetur. Nam sicut peccatorum quæ manere non possunt, quoniam cum sunt prætereunt, reatus tamen manet, & nisi remittatur in æternum manebit, sic illius Concupiscentiæ, quando remittitur, reatus aufertur. Hoc est enim non habere peccatum, reum non esse peccati. Nam si quisquam v. g. fecerit adulterium etiam si nunquam deinceps faciat reus est adulterii, donec reatus ipsius indulgentia remittatur. Habet ergo peccatum, quamvis illud quod admisit jam non sit, quia cum tempore quo factum est præterit. Nam si à peccando desistere hoc esset non habere peccatum, sufficeret ut hoc nos moneret Scriptura. *Fili peccasti, non adjicias iterum*: Non autem sufficit, sed addidit, *Et de pristinis deprecare, ut tibi remittantur*. Manent ergo nisi remittantur. Sed quomodo manent si præterita sunt, nisi quia præterierunt actu, manent reatu, *S. Aug. de Nupt. & Concupisc. lib. 1. cap. 26.* Ego de Concupiscentia dixi quæ est in membris repugnans legi mentis, quamvis Reatus ejus in omnium peccatorum remissione transierit, sicut è contrario sacrificium idolis factum, si deinceps non fiat, præterit actu, sed manet reatu, nisi per indulgentiam remittatur. Quiddam enim tale est sacrificare idolis ut opus ipsum cum sit prætereat, eodemque præterito Reatus ejus maneat venia resolvendus, *Idem contra Julianum, lib. 6. cap. 8.*

Mat. 5. 22.

*Evox⊙ is the word used here, which is translated, shall be in danger, but is of a fuller and more pressing sense, as one which is a debtor, subject, and obliged to endure it, Hefych. *Evox⊙, ὀφειλόμενος, ὀφειλόμενος. The old Latine Translation, Reus erit judicio. As in Virgil, Constituum ante aras voti reus. Servius, Voti reus, Debitor. Unde vota solventes dicimus absolutos. Inde est, Damnabis tu quoque votis, quasi reos facies. So the Syriack מוֹכַרְתָּ לְמוֹת, from מוֹכַר, obligatum, debitorem, reum esse. As therefore Evox⊙ θανάτου is, Mat. 26. 66. מוֹכַרְתָּ לְמוֹת, is not in the intention of the Jewes, he is in danger of death, but, he deserves death, so here.

This debt or obligation to punishment is not onely necessarily resulting from the nature of sin, as it is a breach of the law, nor onely generally delivered in the Scriptures revealing the wrath of God unto all unrighteousnesse, but is yet more particularly represented in the Word, which teacheth us, if we do ill, how *sin lyeth at the door*. Our blessed Saviour thus taught his Disciples. *Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be lyable* (obnoxious or bound over) *to the Judgement; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Racha, shall be lyable* (obnoxious or bound over) *to the Council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be lyable* (obnoxious or bound over) *to hell fire*. So saith our Saviour again, *All sins* more pressing sense, as one which is a debtor, subject, and obliged to endure it, Hefych. *Evox⊙, ὀφειλόμενος, ὀφειλόμενος. The old Latine Translation, Reus erit judicio. As in Virgil, Constituum ante aras voti reus. Servius, Voti reus, Debitor. Unde vota solventes dicimus absolutos. Inde est, Damnabis tu quoque votis, quasi reos facies. So the Syriack מוֹכַרְתָּ לְמוֹת, from מוֹכַר, obligatum, debitorem, reum esse. As therefore Evox⊙ θανάτου is, Mat. 26. 66. מוֹכַרְתָּ לְמוֹת, is not in the intention of the Jewes, he is in danger of death, but, he deserves death, so here.

shall

shall be forgiven unto the sonnes of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is lyable (obnoxious or bound over) to eternall damnation. Whence appeareth clearly the guilt of Sin and obligation to eternall punishment, if there be no remission or forgivenesse of it. God who hath the Sovereign power and absolute dominion over all men, hath made a law to be a perpetuall and universall rule of humane actions; which law whosoever doth violate or transgresse, and thereby sin, (for by sin we understand nothing else but the transgression of the law) is thereby obliged in all equity to suffer the punishment due to that obliquity. And after the act of sin is committed and passed over, this guilt resulting from that act, remaineth; that is, the person who committed it, continueth still a debtor to the vindicative Justice of God, and is obliged to endure the punishment due unto it, which was the second particular to be considered.

Mar. 3. 28, 29.

The third Consideration now followeth, what is the *Forgivenessse of Sin*, or in what *Remission* doth consist. Which at the first appeareth to be an act of God toward a sinner, because the sin was committed against the law of God, and therefore the punishment must be due from him, because the injury was done unto him. But what is the true notion and nature of this Act, or how God doth forgive a sinner, is not so easie to determine; nor can it be concluded out of the words themselves which doe expresse it, the niceties of whole† origins will never be able to yield a just interpretation.

† The word used in the Creed is ἀφίεναι ἀμάρτων, and that generally likewise in use in the New Testament. But from whence we can-

For not be assured

of the nature of this Act of God, because ἀφίεναι and ἀφίεναι are capable of severall interpretations. For sometimes ἀφίεναι is emittere, and ἀφίεναι emissio. As Gen. 35. 18. Ἐξήστω δὲ ὁ κύριος ἀφίεναι αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχὴν, not cum dimitteret eam anima, as it is translated, but cum emitteret ea animam, i. e. efflaret; as ἀφίεναι τὸ πνεῦμα, emisit Spiritum, Mat. 25. 50. So Gen. 45. 2. Καὶ ἀφίεναι φωνὴν μετὰ κλάυθμου, not dimisit, but emisit vocem cum fletu, as ἀφίεναι φωνὴν μετὰ κλάυθμου, emisit

נָשָׂא, as Gen. 50. 17. עָנִין וְנָשָׂא נֶפֶשׁ אֶת חַטֹּאתָיו, ἀφ' αὐτῆς τὴν ἀδικί-
 ας καὶ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν αὐτῆς. Psal. 25. 18. יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ כָּל הַיּוֹם, καὶ ἀφ' αὐτῆς πᾶσαι
 τὰς ἀμαρτίας μῶ. And in that remarkable place, which S. Paul made use of to de-
 clare the nature of Remission of sins. Psal. 32. 1. עָנִין וְנָשָׂא נֶפֶשׁ אֶת חַטֹּאתָיו, μακάριοι
 οἱ ἄνθρωποι αἱ ἀνομίαι. Sometime it is taken for נָשָׂא, as Num. 14. 19. נָשָׂא נֶפֶשׁ
 הַזֶּה עֲוֹנוֹתָיו, ἀφ' αὐτῆς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου. Lev. 4. 20. עָנִין וְנָשָׂא
 καὶ ἀφ' αὐτῆς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν. Now being ἀφ' αὐτῆς in relation to sins, is used for
 נָשָׂא, signifying expiation and reconciliation; for נָשָׂא, signifying elevation, por-
 tion or ablation; for נָשָׂא, signifying pardon and indulgence; we cannot argue
 from the word alone, that God in forgiving sins doth onely and barely release the debt.
 There is therefore no force to be layd upon the words ἀφ' αὐτῆς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, Remissio pec-
 catorum, or as the Ancient Fathers Remissa peccatorum. So Tertullian, Dixi-
 mus de remissa peccatorum, adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 18. S. Cyprian. Epist. 14. Qui
 blasphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum non habet remissionem, sed reus est æterni
 peccati. Idem de Bono Pati. Dominus baptizatur à servo, & remissionem peccato-
 rum daturus, ipse non dedignatur lavacro regenerationis corpus abluere. Idem
 lib. 3. Epist. 8. of an infant, Qui ad remissionem peccatorum recipiendam hoc ipso
 facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata. Adde the
 Interpreter of Irenæus concerning Christ, Remissionem peccatorum existentem his qui
 credunt in eum.

therefore I conceive the true nature of *forgiveness of sins*
 is rather to be understood by the consideration of all such
 ways and means which were used by God in the work-
 ing and performing of it, then in this, or any other, word
 which is made use of in expressing it.

Now that we may understand what was done toward
 remission of sins, that from thence we may conclude what
 is done in it: it is first to be observed, that *almost all*
things by the Law were purged with blood, and without
shedding of blood there is no remission. And what was then
 legally done, was but a type of that which was to be per-
 formed by Christ; and therefore the blood of Christ must
 necessarily be involved in the remission of sins; for he *once*
in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the
sacrifice of himself. It must then be acknowledged, and
 can be denied by none, that Christ did suffer a painfull
 and a shamefull death, as we have formerly described it;
 that the death which he endured, he did then suffer for sin;
 for *this man*, saith the Apostle, *offered one sacrifice for*

Heb. 9. 22.
 χωρίς αίμα-
 τος ἁγιασμοῦ
 καὶ ἀφεσις.

Heb. 9. 26. it
 is not onely
 ἀφ' αὐτῆς, but ἀ-
 φ' αὐτῆς αὐτῆς.

Heb. 10. 12.

1 Pet. 3. 18.

Heb. 7. 26.

Isa. 53. 5.

Rom. 4. 25.

Gal. 1. 4.

1 Cor. 15. 3.

Isa. 53. 6.

2 Cor. 5. 21.

Mat. 26. 28.

Ephes. 1. 7.

sins; that the sins for which he suffered were not his own, for Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust; he was holy, harmlesse, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and therefore had no sin to suffer for; that the sins for which he suffered, were ours, for he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; He was delivered for our offences, he gave himself for our sins, he dyed for our sins according to the Scriptures; that the dying for our sins was suffering death as a punishment taken upon himself to free us from the punishment due unto our sins; for God laid on him the iniquity of us all, and made him to be Sin for us who knew no Sin: he hath born our griefs and carried our sorrows, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed; that by the suffering of this punishment to free us from the punishment due unto our sins it cometh to passe that our sins are forgiven, for, This is my bloud, saith our Saviour of the New Testament, or Covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. In Christ we have redemption through his bloud, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.

In which deduction or series of truths we may easily perceive that *the forgiveness of sins*, which is promised unto us, which we upon that promise doe believe, containeth in it a Reconciliation of an offended God, and a Satisfaction unto a just God; it containeth a Reconciliation, as without which God cannot be conceived to remit; it comprehendeth a Satisfaction, as without which God was resolved not be reconciled.

For the first of these, We may be assured of forgiveness of sins, because Christ by his death hath reconciled God unto us, who was offended by our sins; and that he hath done so, we are assured; because he which before was angry with us, upon the consideration of Christs death, becomes propitious unto us, and did ordein Christs death to be a propitiation for us. For we are *justified freely by his grace*

grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. We have an Advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins. For God loved us and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins. It is evident therefore that Christ did render God propitious unto us by his blood, (that is his sufferings unto death) who before was offended with us for our sins. And this propitiation amounted to a reconciliation, that is a kindnesse after wrath. We must conceive that God was angry with mankind before he determined to give our Saviour; we cannot imagine that God who is essentially just, should not abominate iniquity. The first affection we can conceive in him upon the lapse of man, is wrath & indignation. God therefore was most certainly offended before he gave a Redeemer, and though it be most true, that he *so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son*; yet there is no incongruity in this, that a Father should be offended with that son which he loveth, and at that time offended with him when he loveth him. Notwithstanding therefore that God loved men whom he created, yet he was offended with them when they sinned, and gave his Son to suffer for them, that through that Son's obedience he might be reconciled to them.

This Reconciliation is clearly delivered in the Scriptures as wrought by Christ; For *all are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ*; and that by virtue of his death, for *when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, making peace through the blood of his crosse, and by him reconciling all things unto himself*. In vain it is objected that the Scripture saith our Saviour reconciled men to God, but no where teacheth that he reconciled God to man; for in the language of the Scripture to reconcile a man to God, is in our vulgar language to reconcile God to man, that is to cause him who before was angry and offended with him.

2 Cor. 5. 18.

Rom. 5. 10.

Col. 1. 20.

1 Sam. 29. 4.
 Ἐν τίνι διαλ-
 λήσῃς τὸν
 πρὸς αὐτὸν;
 ὃν τῶν κει-
 ραλῶν τῶν
 δεινῶν κείνων;
 ΠΑΡΑ, acce-
 ptum se red-
 det, ita se ge-
 ret ut Saul e-
 um in gratiam
 recipere velit.
 Mat. 5. 23, 24.
 ὁρῶ τὸν διαλ-
 λήσῃς τὸν
 ἀδελφὸν σου.
 1 Cor. 2. 11.

him to be gracious and propitious to him. As the Princes of the Philistines spake of *David*, *Wherewith should he reconcile himself unto his Master? should it not be with the heads of these men?* wherewith shall he reconcile *Saul* who is so highly offended with him, wherewith shall he render him gracious and favourable but by betraying these men unto him? As our Saviour adviseth, *If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and goe thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother*, that is, reconcile thy brother to thy self, whom thou hast injured, render him by thy submission favourable unto thee, who hath something against thee, and is offended with thee. As the Apostle adviseth the wife that *departeth from her husband, to remain unmarried; or to be reconciled to her husband*, that is to appease and get the favour of her husband. In the like manner we are said to be reconciled unto God, when God is reconciled, appeased and become gracious and favourable unto us, and Christ is said to reconcile us unto God, when he hath moved, and obtained of God to be reconciled unto us, when he hath appeased him and restored us unto his favour. Thus *when we were enemies we were reconciled to God*, that is, notwithstanding he was offended with us for our sins, we were restored unto his favour *by the death of his Son*.

Rom. 5. 10.

Mat. 20. 28.
 Δίδωαι τὴν ψυ-
 χὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ
 πολλῶν. What is
 the true notion
 of λύτρεσθαι will
 easily appear,

because both the origination and use of the word is sufficiently known. The origination is from λύειν solvere, to loose, λύτρεσθαι quasi λύτρεσθαι. Etym. Ὁρίτρεται τὰ ἀρετῆς, ὡς ἀπὸ λύτρεται τὰ λύτρεται. Eustath. Δίδωαι ὃ Ὁρίτρεται (ita leg.) τὰ τρεφῆται ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ συγκαταστήν, ὡς λύτρεται λύτρεται, σωτῆς αὐτοῦ, ἢ λύτρεται.

Λύτρον igitur quicquid datur ut quis solvatur. Ἐπὶ αἰχμαλώτων ὁξωνήσις οἰκῶν τὸ λύεσθαι. ὁ δὲν καὶ λύτρα τὰ δῶρα λέγονται εἰς τὸ τοῦτο διδόμενα. Eustathius upon that of Homer Iliad. αἰ. Λυσσάμενος τε δούρατες. It is properly spoken of such things as are given to redeem a captive, or recover a man into a free condition. Hesych. πάντα τὰ διδόμενα εἰς ἀνάκλησιν ἀνθρώπων, (so I read it, not ἀνέκλησιν.) So that whatsoever is given for such a purpose is λύτρον, and whatsoever is not given for such an end serveth not that name in Greek. As the city Antandrus was so called because it was given in exchange for a man who was a captive. Ὅτι Ἀσκάριος αἰχμαλωτὸς ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Πηλασγῶν καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτὴν τὴν πόλιν ἔδωκε λύτρα, καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ, Etym. So that there can be nothing more proper in the Greek language than the words of our Saviour, δύναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. δύναι λύτρον for λύτρον is τὸ διδόμενον, and ἀντὶ πολλῶν, for it is given ἀντὶ ἀνθρώπων, as that city was called Ἀντανδρεῖς, ἥ γὰρ ἀντὶ ἀνδρός διδωμένη. And therefore 1 Tim. 2. 6. it is said, ὁ δὲς ἑαυτὸν ἀντὶ λύτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων.

such as are any way in captivity; any thing laid down by way of compensation, to take off a bond or obligation, whereby he which before was bound becometh free. Now all sinners were obliged to undergoe such punishments as are proportionate to their sins, and were by that obligation captivated and in bonds, and Christ did give his life a ransom for them, and that a proper ransom, if that his life were of any price, and given as such. For a ransom is properly nothing else but something of † price given by way of redemption, to buy or purchase that which is detained, or given for the releasing of that which is intralled. But it is most evident that the life of Christ was layd down as a price, neither is it more certain that he dyed, then that he bought us; *Ye are bought with a price*, saith the Apostle, and it is the *Lord who bought us*, and the price which he paid was his blood, for *we are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ*. Now as it was the blood of Christ, so was it a price given by way of compensation, and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction. For as the gravity of the offence and iniquity of the sin is augmented, and encreaseth according to the dignity of the person offended and injured by it, so the value, price and dignity of that which is given by way of compen-

† Hesych. Λύτρον, τίμημα.

1 Cor. 6. 20.

7. 23.

2 Pet. 2. 1.

1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Z z z z fation,

Act. 10. 28.

sation, is raised according to the dignity of the person making the satisfaction. God is of infinite Majesty, against whom we have sinned, and Christ is of the same divinity, who gave his life a ranfome for sinners; for *God hath purchased his Church with his own blood.*

If then we consider together, on our side the nature & obligation of sin, in Christ the satisfaction made, and reconciliation wrought, we shall easily perceive how God forgiveth sins, and in what Remission of them consisteth. Man being in all conditions under some law of God, who hath Sovereign power and dominion over him, and therefore owing absolute obedience to that law, whensoever any way he transgresseth that law, or deviateth from that rule, he becomes thereby a sinner, and contracteth a guilt which is an obligation to endure a punishment proportionable to his offence, and God who is the Law-giver and Sovereign, becoming now the party wronged & offended, hath a most just right to punish man as an offender. But Christ taking upon him the nature of man, and offering himself a sacrifice for sin, maketh a sufficient compensation and full satisfaction for the sins of man, which God accepting, becometh reconciled unto us, and for the punishment which Christ endured, taketh off our obligation to eternall punishment, and in this act of God consisteth *the forgivenesse of Sins*. Which is sufficient for the first part of the Explication of this Article, as being designed for nothing else but to declare what is the true notion of *Remission of Sins*, in what that action doth consist.

The second part of the Explication, taking notice not onely of the substance, but also of the Order of the Article, observing the Immediate connexion of it with the *Holy Church*, and the relation, which in the opinion of the Ancients it hath unto it, will endeavour to instruct us how this great Priviledge of *forgivenesse of sins* is propounded in the Church, how it may be procured and obtained by the members of the Church.

At the same time when our Saviour sent the Apostles to gather a Church unto him, he foretold that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem*; and when the Church was first constituted, they thus exhorted those whome they desired to come into it, *Repent and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out*, and, *Be it known unto you that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of Sins*. From whence it appeareth that the Jews and Gentiles were invited to the Church of Christ, that they might therein receive remission of sins; that the doctrine of remission of all sins propounded and preached to all men, was proper and peculiar to the Gospel, which teacheth us *that by Christ all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses*. Therefore John the Baptist, who went before the face of the Lord to prepare his wayes, gave knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their Sins.

Luc. 24. 47.

Act. 3. 29.

13. 38.

Act. 13. 39.

This, as it was preached by the Apostles at the first gathering of the Church of Christ, I call proper and peculiar to the Gospel, because the same doctrine was not so propounded by the law. For if we consider the Law it self strictly and under the bare notion of a Law, it promised life onely upon perfect, absolute, and uninterrupted obedience; the voice thereof was onely this, *Do this and live*. Some of the greater sins nominated & specified in the law, had annexed unto them the sentence of death, and that sentence irreverfible; nor was there any other way or means left in the law of *Moses* by which that punishment might be taken off. As for other lesse and more ordinary sins, there were sacrifices appointed for them, and when those sacrifices were offered and accepted, God was appeased, and the offences were released. Whatsoever else we read of sins forgiven under the law, was of some speciall divine indulgence, more then was promised by *Moses*.

Z z z z 2

Now

Now as to the atonement made by the sacrifices, it clearly had relation to the death of the *Messias*, and whatsoever virtue was in them did operate through his death alone. As he was the Lamb *slain from the foundation of the world*, so all atonements which were ever made, were onely effectually by his blood. But though no Sin was ever forgiven but by virtue of that satisfaction, though God was never reconciled unto any sinner but by intuition of that propitiation, yet the generall doctrine of remission of sins was never clearly revealed, and publickly preached to all nations till the coming of the Saviour of the world, whose name was therefore called *Jesus*, because he was *to save his people from their sins*.

Being therefore we are assured that the preaching Remission of sins belongeth not onely certainly, but in some sense peculiarly, to the Church of Christ; it will be next considerable how this Remission is conferred upon any persons in the Church.

For a full satisfaction in this particular two things are very observable, one at the Initiation, the other at the Continuation of a Christian. For the first of these, it is the most Generall and irrefragable Assertion of all to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the Baptisme of the same person. For the second, it is as certain that all sins committed by any person after baptisme, are remissible, and the person committing those Sins, shall receive forgiveness upon true Repentance at any time according to the Gospel.

First, it is certain that *Forgiveness of Sins* was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ, and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of Baptism, did also receive the benefit of that Ordinance, which is *remission of Sins*. *John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the Baptism of repentance for the remission of Sins.*
And

And S. Peter made this the exhortation of his first Sermon, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.* It is therefore sufficiently certain that Baptism as it was instituted by Christ after the preadministration of S. John, wheresoever it was received with all qualifications necessary in the person accepting, and conferred with all things necessary to be performed by the person administering, was most infallibly efficacious, as to this particular, that is, to the remission of all sins committed before the administration of this Sacrament.

As those which are received into the Church by the Sacrament of Baptism receive the Remission of their sins of which they were guilty before they were baptized: so after they are thus made members of the Church, they receive remission of their future sins by their repentance. Christ who hath left us a pattern of prayer, hath thereby taught us for ever to implore and beg the forgivenesse of our sins; that as we through the frailty of our nature are alwayes subject unto sin, so we should alwayes exercise the acts of repentance, and for ever seek the favour of God. This then is the comfort of the Gospel, that as it discovereth sin within us, so it propoundeth a remedy untous. While we are in this life incompassed with flesh, while the allurements of the world, while the stratagemes of Satan, while the infirmities and corruptions of our na-

* Excepto baptismatis munere, quod contra originale peccatum donatum est, (ut quod generatione attrahitur est regeneratione detrahatur, & tamen activa

quoque peccata quaecunque corde, ore, opere commissa invenerit tollit) hac ergo excepta magna indulgentia (unde incipit hominis renovatio) in qua solvitur omnis reatus & ingeneratus & additus, ipsa etiam vita cetera jam ratione utentis ætatis, quantalibet præpolleat fecunditate justitiæ, sine remissione peccatorum non agitur; quoniam filii Dei quamdiu mortaliter vivunt cum morte consurgunt: & quamvis de illis sit veraciter dictum, *Quot Spiritu Dei aguntur, hi filii sunt Dei*: sic tamen Spiritu Dei excitantur, & tanquam filii Dei proficiunt ad Deum, ut etiam Spiritu suo (maxime aggravante corruptibili corpore) tanquam filii hominum quibusdam moribus humanis deficient ad seipsos & peccent, S. Augustin. *Enchirid.* cap. 44.

ture betray us to the transgression of the law of God, we are alwayes subject to offend, from whence, whosoever saith *that he hath no sin is a lyer, contradicting himself, and contracting iniquity by pretending innocency.*

2 Pet. 2. 4.

The necessity of the belief of this Article appeareth first, because there can be no Christian consolation without this perswasion. For we have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God; we must acknowledge that every sinner is a guilty person, and that guilt consisteth in an obligation to endure eternall punishment from the wrath of God provoked by our sins; from whence nothing else can arise but a fearfull expectation of everlasting misery. So long as guilt remaineth on the soul of man, so long is he in the condition of the Devils, *delivered into chains and reserved unto judgement.* For we all fell as well as they, but with this difference, remission of sins is promised unto us, but to them it is not.

Psal. 32. 1, 2.

Secondly, it is necessary to believe the *forgivenesse of sins*, that thereby we may sufficiently esteem Gods goodnesse and our happinesse. When man was fallen into sin, there was no possibility left to him to work out his recovery; that soul which had sinned must of necessity dye, the wrath of God abiding upon him for ever. There can be nothing imaginable in that man which should move God not to shew a demonstration of his justice upon him; there can be nothing without him which could pretend to rescue him from the sentence of an offended and almighty God. Glorious therefore must the goodnesse of our God appear, who dispenseth with his law, who taketh off the guilt, who looseth the obligation, who not imputeth the sin. This is Gods goodnesse, this is mans happinesse. For *blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no iniquity.* The year of release, the year of Jubilee, was a time of publick joy; and there is no voice like that, *thy sins are forgiven thee.* By this a
man

man is rescued from infernall pains, secured from the everlasting flames; by this he is made capable of heaven, by this he is assured of eternall happinesse.

Thirdly, it is necessary to believe *the forgivenesse of sins*, that by the sense thereof we may be enflamed with the love of God. For that love doth naturally follow from such a sense, appeareth by the Parable in the Gospel, *There was a certain creditour which had two debtors, the one ought him five hundred pence, the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.* Upon which case our Saviour made this question, *which of them will love him most?* He supposeth both the debtors will love him because the creditor forgave them both; and he collecteth the degrees of love will answer proportionably to the quantity of the debt forgiven. We are the debtors, and our debts are sins, and the creditor is God: the remission of our sins is the frank forgiving of our debts, and for that we are obliged to return our love.

Luc. 6. 41, 42.

Fourthly, the true notion of *forgivenessse of sins* is necessary to teach us what we owe to Christ, to whome, and how far we are indebted for this forgivenessse. *Through this man is preached unto us forgivenessse of sins*, and without a surety we had no release. He rendred God propitious unto our persons, because he gave himself as a satisfaction for our sins. While thus he took off our obligation to punishment he laid upon us a new obligation of obedience. We are *not our own* who are bought with a price; we must glorifie God in our bodies and in our spirits, which are Gods. We must be no longer *the servants of men*; we are *the servants of Christ* who are bought with a price.

Act. 13. 38.

1 Cor. 6. 19, 20.

1 Cor. 7. 22, 23.

Fifthly, it is necessary to believe remission of sins as wrought by the blood of Christ, by which the Covenant was ratified and confirmed; which mindeth us of a condition required. It is the nature of a Covenant to expect performances on both parts: and therefore if we look for forgivenessse promised, we must perform repentance commanded.

Act. 5. 31.

Luc. 24. 47.

manded. These two were alwayes preached together, and those which God hath joyned ought no man to put asunder. Christ did truly appear a *Prince and a Saviour*, and it was to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins; He joyned these two in the Apostles commission, saying, that *Repentance and Remission of sins should be preached in his name throughout all nations.*

From hence every one may learn what he is explicitly to believe and confesse in this Article of *forgiveness of sins*; for thereby he is conceived to intend thus much, I do freely and fully acknowledge, and with unspeakable comfort embrace this as a most necessary and infallible truth, that whereas every sin is a transgression of the law of God, and upon every transgression there remaineth a guilt upon the person of the transgressor, and that guilt is an obligation to endure eternall punishment, so that all men being concluded under sin they were all obliged to suffer the miseries of eternall death, it pleased God to give his Son, and his Son to give himself to be a surety for this debt, and to release us from these bonds; and because without shedding of blood there is no remission, he gave his life a sacrifice for sin, he laid it down as a rancome, even his precious blood as a price by way of compensation and satisfaction to the will and justice of God, by which propitiation God who was by our sins offended, became reconciled, and being so, took off our obligation to eternall punishment, which is the guilt of our sins, and appointed in the Church of Christ the Sacrament of Baptisme for the first remission, and repentance for the constant forgiveness of all following trespasses; and thus *I believe the forgiveness of sins.*

ARTI-

ARTICLE XI.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE
B O D Y.

THis Article was anciently deliver'd and acknowledged † by all Churches, onely with this difference, that whereas in other places it was express'd in generall terms, *the Resurrection of the flesh*, they of the Church of *Aquileia* by the addition of a Pronounne pronounced it to every single believer in a more particular way of expression, *the Resurrection of this flesh*. And though we have translated it in our *English Creed the Resurrection of the body*; yet neither the *Greek* nor *Latine* ever delivered this Article in those terms, but in these, *the Resurrection of the flesh*; because there may be ambiguity in the one, in relation to the celestially and spiritually bodies, but there can be no collusion in the other. Onely it will be necessary, for shewing our agreement with the Ancient Creeds, to declare that as by *flesh* they understood the body of man, and not any other flesh, so we, when we translate it *body*, understand no other *body* but

† Cum omnes Ecclesie ita sacramentum Symboli tradant, ut postquam dixerant peccatorum remissionem, addant carnis resurrectionem; sancta Aquileiensis Ecclesia ubi tradit carnis resurrectionem, addit unius pronominis syllabam; & pro eo quod ceteri dicunt, carnis resurrectionem, nos dicimus, huius carnis resurrectionem, Ruffin. Apol. advers. Hieron. Satis cauta & provida adjectione fidem Symboli Ecclesia nostra docet, quæ in eo quod à cæteris traditur, carnis resurrectionem, uno addito pronomine tradit, huius carnis resurrectionem, Id. in Symb. *The Greeks always say *αὐτῶν τῶν σαρκῶν*, the Latines carnis resurrectionem. And this was to be observed because, being we read of spiritual bodies, some would acknowledge the resurrection of the body, who would deny the resurrection of the flesh. Of this S. Jerome gives an account, in a word of the words of the Creed. Exempli causa pauca subiiciam, *Credimus, inquit, resurrectionem futuram corporum*. Hoc si bene dicatur, pura confessio est; sed quia corpora sunt celestia, & terrestria, & aer iste & aura tenuis juxta naturam suam corpora nominantur, corpus ponunt, non carnem, ut Orthodoxis corpus audiens carnem putet, Hæreticus spiritum recognoscit. Hæc enim est prima decipula, quæ si deprehensa fuerit, instruit alios dolos, & innocentis similibus, & malitiosos nos vocat, & quasi simpliciter credentes avertit, *Credimus resurrectionem carnis*. Hoc vero cum dixit vulgus indoctum putat sibi sufficere, maxime quia id ipsum & in Symb. creditur, Ep. 55. ad Pam. & Oceân.

A a a a a

luch

such a body of flesh, of the same nature which it had before it was by death separated from the Soul. We see by dayly experience, that all men are mortall; that the body left by the soul the salt and life thereof, putrifieth and consumeth, and according to the sentence of old, returneth unto dust; but these bodies, as frail and mortall as they are, consisting of this corruptible flesh, are the subject of this Article, in which we professe to believe *the Resurrection of the body.*

† Pag. 515.

When we treated concerning the Resurrection of Christ, we † delivered the proper notion and nature of the Resurrection in Generall, that from thence we might conclude that our Saviour did truly rise from the dead. Being now to explain the Resurrection to come, we shall not need to repeat what we then delivered, or make any addition as to that particular, but referring the Reader to that which is there explained, it will be necessary onely to consider what is the Resurrection to come, who they are which shall be raised, how we are assured they shall rise, and in what manner all shall be performed. And this Resurrection hath some peculiar difficulties different from those which might seem to obstruct the belief of Christ's Resurrection. For the body of the Son of God did never see corruption; all the parts thereof continued in the same condition in which they were after his most precious soul had left them, they were onely deposited in a Sepulchre, otherwise the grave had no power over them. But other mortall bodies, after the soul hath deserted them, are left to all the sad effects of their mortality; we may say *to corruption, Thou art my Father, to the worm thou art my* Job 17. 14, 16. *Mother and my Sister; our corps go down to the bars of the pit, and rest together in the dust.* Our death is not a simple dissolution, a bare separation of soul and body as Christ's was, but our whole Tabernacle is fully dissolved, and every part thereof crumbled into dust and ashes, scattered, mingled, and confounded with the dust of the earth. There

There is a description of a kind of Resurrection in the Prophet *Ezekiel*, in which there is supposed a valley full of bones, and there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, and their breath came into them, and they liv'd and stood upon their feet. But in the Resurrection to come we cannot suppose the bones in the valley, for they are dissolved into dust as well as the other parts.

We must therefore endeavour to shew that the bodies of men howsoever corrupted, wheresoever in their parts dispersed, how long soever dead, shall hereafter be recollected in themselves, and united to their own souls. And for the more facil and familiar proceeding in this so highly concerning truth, I shall make use of this method; First to prove, that such a Resurrection is not in it self impossible. Secondly, to shew that it is upon generall considerations highly probable. Thirdly, to demonstrate that it is upon Christian principles infallibly certain. It is not in it self impossible, therefore no man can absolutely deny it; it is upon naturall and morall grounds highly probable, therefore all men may rationally expect it; it is upon Evangelicall principles infallibly certain, therefore all Christians must firmly believe it.

First, I confesse the *Philosophers* of old did look upon the Resurrection of the body as impossible, and be in the power of God, for so he makes Apollo speak to the

Πέδας μ' αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἔστι τὸ δ' ἄκρ' ὅς,
καὶ κάρτα πολλὰ μιν χανὴ λυήεσθαι.
Ἄνδρες δ' ἐπειδὴ αἰμ' ἀναπαύειν κόπης
Ἀπαξ θανάτῳ, ἅπας ἔς ἀγαστας.
Τύτων ἐπιδόξας ἐκ ἐπίνων παλαιοῖς
Οὐ μὲν, τὰ δ' ἄλλα πῶτ' ἀνὰ τὴν κατὰ
Σφίγαν τίθειν, ἔδεν ἀδελφῶν πέτῃ.

Æschyl. Eumenid.

Uti anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur: ut carnis restitutio negatur, de una omnium Philosophorum schola sumitur. Terull.

A a a a a 2 though

Act. 17. 18.

though some of them thought, the souls of the dead did live again, yet they never conceived that they were united to the same bodies, and that their flesh should rise out of the dust that it might be conjoynd to the spirit of a man. We read of *certain Philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks, who encountred S. Paul, and when they heard of the resurrection they mocked him, some saying, that he seemed to be a setter forth of strange Gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the Resurrection.* But as the Ancient Philosophers thought a Creation impossible, because they looked onely upon the constant works of nature, among which they never find any thing produced out of nothing, and yet we have already proved a Creation not onely possible, but perform'd; so did they think a Resurrection of corrupted, dissolved, and dissipated bodies to be as impossible, because they could never observe any action or operation in nature, which did or could produce any such effect; and yet we being not tyed to the consideration of nature onely, but estimating things possible or impossible by the power of God, will easily demonstrate that there is no impossibility that the dead should rise.

For, if the Resurrection of the dead be impossible, it must be so in one of these respects, either in reference to the Agent, or in relation to the Patient; either because it is a work of so much difficulty that there neither is nor can be any Agent of wisdom, power, and activity sufficient to effect it; or else because the soul of man is so far separated by death from the body, and the parts of the body so much dissolved from themselves and altered from their former nature, that they are absolutely incapable by any power to be united as they were. Either both or one of these two must be the reason of the impossibility, if the Resurrection be impossible; for if the body be capable of being raised, and there be any Agent of sufficient ability to raise it, the resurrection of it must be possible.

Now

Now if the Resurrection were impossible in respect of the Agent which should effect it, the impossibility must arise † either from an insufficiency of knowledge or of power; for if either the Agent know not what is to be done, or if he know it, but hath no power to do it, either he will not attempt it, or if he do, must fail in the attempt; but that, of which he hath perfect knowledge, and full power to effect, cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent endued with such knowledge, armed with such power.

† Τὸ ἀδύνατον
πρὶς γινώσκειν
καὶ κατ' ἀλή-
θειαν τοῦτον
ἢ ἐκ τῆς μὴ γι-
γνώσκειν τὸ
γεννησόμενον ἢ
ἐκ τῆς δυνάμει
ἀρκούντος μὴ ἴ-

χειν πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι καλῶς τὸ ἐγγνωσόμενον. Ὁ δὲ ἀγνοῶν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν δεδυνάμει ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐγχειρήσει ὅτε ποιῇσαι τὸ ὁρῶναι δυνάμειν ὅσον ἀγνοεῖ. ὅτε γινώσκων καλῶς τὸ ποιησόμενον, καὶ πόθεν ἔσται αὐτῷ πῶς, δυνάμειν ἢ μὴ μὴ ἴσως ἔχων πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ γεννησόμενον ἢ μὴ ἀρκούντος ἔχων ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐγχειρήσει πῶς ἀρκούντος, οἱ σωφρονεῖν καὶ πῶς ἰδίαν ἐπισκέψεται δυνάμειν, ἐγχειρήσει ὅσον ἀρκούντος ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελέσει τὸ δέξασθαι, Athenagoras de Resurrectione.

Now when we say the Resurrection is possible, we say not it is so to men or Angels or any creature of a limited knowledge or finite power, but we attribute it to God, with whom nothing is impossible; his understanding is infinite, he knoweth all the men which ever lived since the foundation, or shall live unto the dissolution of the world, he knoweth whereof all things are made, from what dust we came, into what dust we shall return. Our substance was not hid from thee, O Lord, when we were made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth; thine eyes did see our substance, yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all our members written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. Thus every particle of our bodies, every dust and atome which belongeth to us, is known to him that made us. The Generation of our flesh is clearly seen by the Father of spirits, the augmentation of the same is known to him whom we live, move, and have our being, the dissolution of our tabernacles is perceived by that

A a a a 3 God,

God, by whom the *very hairs of our head are all num-*
bred, and *without whom one sparrow shall not fall to the*
 Mat. 10. 29, 30. *ground*. He which numbeth the sands of the sea, knoweth all
 the scattered bones, seeth into all the graves & tombs, search-
 eth all the repositories & dormitories in the earth, knoweth
 what dust belongeth to each body, what body to each soul.
 Again, as his all-seeing eye observeth every particle of
 dissolved and corrupted man, so doth he also see and know
 all wayes and means by which these scattered parts should
 be united, by which this ruined fabrick should be recom-
 posed, he knoweth how every bone should be brought to
 it's old neighbour bone, how every sinew may be reim-
 broydered on it; he understandeth what are the proper
 parts to be conjoyned, what is the proper *gluten* by which
 they may become united. The Resurrection therefore
 cannot be impossible in relation to the Agent upon any
 deficiency of knowledge how to effect it.

And as the Wisdom is infinite, so the Power of this
 Agent is illimited; for God is as much Omnipotent as
 Omniscient. There can be no opposition made against him,
 because all power is his; nor can he receive a check against
 whom there is no resistance. All creatures must not onely
 suffer, but doe what he will have them; they are not onely
 passively, but actively obedientiall. There is no atome
 of the dust or ashes but must be where it pleaseth God, and
 be applyed and make up what and how it seemeth good to
 him. The Resurrection therefore cannot be impossible in
 relation unto God upon any disability to effect it, and
 consequently there is no impossibility in reference to the
 Agent, or him which is to raise us.

Secondly, the Resurrection is not impossible in relation
 to the Patient, because where we look upon the power of
 God, nothing can be impossible but that which involveth a
 contradiction, as we before have proved; and there can
 be no contradiction in this, that he which was, and now
 is not, should hereafter be what before he was. It is so far
 from

from a repugnancy, that it rather containeth a rationall and apparent possibility, that man who was once dust, becoming dust, should become man again. Whatsoever we loose in death is not lost to God: as no creature could be made out of nothing but by him, so can it not be reduced into nothing but by the same: though therefore the parts of the body of man be dissolved, yet they perish not; they loose not their own entity when they part with their relation to humanity; they are * laid up in the secret places, and lodged in the Chambers of nature, and it is no more a contradiction that they should become the parts of the same body of man to which they did belong, then that after his death they should become the parts of any other body, as we see they doe. Howsoever they are scattered, or wheresoever lodged, they are † within the knowledge and power of God, and can have no repugnancy by their separation to be reunited when and how he pleaseth. The first dust of which man was made; was as far from being flesh, as any ashes now or dust can be; it was onely an Omnipotent power which could mould that into an humane body, and breathe into the nostrils of it the breath of life. The same power therefore, which must alwayes be, can still make of the dust returning from the bodies of men unto the earth, humane bones and flesh, as well as of the dust which first came from the earth: for

* Non sola anima seponitur, habet & caro suos sinus interim, in aquis, in ignibus, in aliti- bus, in bestiis; cum in hac dissolvi vide- tur, velut in vasa transfunditur; *Tertull. de Resurrectione carnis*, cap. 68.

Tu perire Deo

credis si quid oculis nostris hebetibus subtrahitur? Corpus omne sive are- scit in pulverem, sive in humorem solvitur, vel in cinerem comprimitur, vel in nidorem tenuatur, subducitur nobis, sed Deo elementorum custodi reser- vatur, *Minutius Felix in Octavio*. Omnia quæ dissepuntur, & in favillas quasdam putrescunt, integra Deo sunt, in illa enim elementa mundi eunt unde primo venerunt, *S. August. in Psalm. Enarrat. 62.*

† Absit

autem ut ad resuscitanda corpora vitæque reddenda non possit Omnipotentia Cre- atoris omnia revocare quæ vel bestia vel ignis absumpsit; vel in pulveré cinerem- que collapsum, vel in humorem solutum, vel in auras est exhalatum. Absit ut sinus ullus, secretumque naturæ ita recipiat aliquid subtractum sensibus nostris, ut omnium Creatoris aut lateat cognitionem, aut effugiat potestatem, *S. August. de Civitate Dei*, lib. 22, cap. 20.

if it.

† Recogita
quid fueris an-
tequam esses,
utique nihil.
Meminisses e-
nim si quid fu-
isses. Qui ergo
nihil fueras pri-
usquam esses,

idem nihil factus cum esse desieris, cur non possis esse rursus de nihilo, ejusdem Authoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse de nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? Qui non eras, factus es, cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde, si potes, rationem qua factus es, & tunc require qua fies. Et tamen facilius utiq; fies quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es quod nunquam fuisti aliquando, *Tertull. Apolog. cap. 48.* Utique idoneus est reficere qui fecit. Quanto plus est fecisse quam refecisse, initium dedisse quam reddidisse; ita restitutionem carnis faciliorem credas institutione, *Idem de Resur. carnis, cap. 11.* Difficilius est id quod non sit incipere, quam id quod fuerit iterare, *Minutius Felix in Octavio.* Utique plus est facere quod nunquam fuit, quam reparare quod fuit. Quomodo ergo impossibile esse dicis, ut Deus qui hominem formavit ex nihilo reformet? Quomodo nos suscitare non potest conversos in pulverem, qui etiam si in nihilum rediremus, facere poterat ut essemus, sicut effecit nos esse, cum antea nunquam fuissemus, *S. August. de Verbis Apost. Resur. 19. To the same purpose the Jewes, ויהי לנו נחיה*
: יהיו לנו נחיה

Secondly, the Resurrection is not onely in it self possible, so that no man with any reason can absolutely deny it; but it is also upon many generall considerations highly probable, so that all men may very rationally expect it. If we consider the principles of humanity, the parts of which we all consist, we cannot conceive this present life to be proportionable to our composition. The souls of men as they are immateriall, so are they immortal, and being once created by the Father of spirits, they receive a subsistence for eternity; the body is framed by the same God to be a companion for his spirit, and a man born into the world consisteth of these two. Now the life of the most aged person is but short, and many far ignobler creatures of a longer duration. Some of the souls of the air, severall of the fishes of the sea, many of the beasts of the field, di-

vers of the plants of the earth are of a more durable constitution, and out-live the sons of men. And can we think that such materiall and mortall, that such inunderstanding souls should by God and nature be furnished with bodies of so long permanſion, and that our spirits should be joy-
ned unto flesh so subject to corruption, so suddenly dissolvable, were it not that they lived but once, and so enjoyed that life for a longer season, and then went soul and body to the same destruction, never to be restored to the same subsistence; but when the soul of man which is immortal is forced from it's body in a shorter time, nor can by any means continue with it half the years which many other creatures live, it is because this is not the onely life belonging to the sonnes of men, and so the soul may at a shorter warning leave the body which it shall resume again.

Again, if we look upon our selves as men, we are free agents, and therefore capable of doing good or evil, and consequently ordina-
ble unto reward or punishment. The Angels which are above us, and did sin, received their punishment without a death, because being onely spirits they were subject to no other dissolution then annihilation, which cannot consist with longer suffering punishment; those which continued in their station were rewarded and confirmed for all eternity, and thus all are incapable of a Resurrection. The creatures which are below us, and for want of freedome cannot sin, or act any thing morally either good or evil, they cannot deserve after this life either to be punished or rewarded; and therefore when they dye, they continue in the state of death for ever. Thus those which are above us shall not rise from the dead, because they are punished or rewarded without dying, and where no death is there can be no resurrection from the dead. Those which are below us, are neither capable of reward or punishment for any thing acted in this life, and therefore though they dye, yet shall they never rise, because

B b b b b there

there is no reason for their Resurrection. But man by the noblenesse of his better part being free to do what is good or evil while he liveth, and by the frailty of his body being subject to death, and yet after that being capable in another world to receive a reward for what he hath done well, and a punishment for what he hath done ill in the flesh, it is necessary that he should rise from the dead to enjoy the one or suffer the other. For there is not onely no just Retribution rendred in this life to man, but considering the ordinary condition of things, it cannot be. For it is possible, and often cometh to passe, that one man may commit such sins as all the punishments of this life can no way equalize them. What is then more proper considering the providence of a most just God, then to believe that man shall suffer in another life such torments as will be proportionable to his demerits? Nor can we with reason think that the soul alone shall undergoe those sufferings, because the lawes which were given to us are not made in respect of that alone, but have most frequent reflexion on the body, † without which in this life the soul can neither do nor suffer any thing. It is therefore highly probable from the generall consideration of humane actions and divine retributions, that there shall be a *Resurrection of the flesh, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whither it be good or bad.*

† Quod congruet iudicari hoc competet etiam resuscitari, Tertullian. de Resurrectione

carnis, cap. 14. Negent operarum societatem ut merito possint mercedem negare. Non sit particeps in sententia caro, si n fuerit & in causa. Sola anima revocetur, si sola decedit. At enim non magis sola decedit, quam sola decucurrit illud unde decedit, vitam hanc dico, *ibid.* cap. 15. Cum omnis vitæ nostræ usus in corporis animæque consortio sit, resurrectio autem aut boni actus præmium habeat aut poenam improbi, necesse est corpus resurgere cujus actus expenditur. Quomodo enim in iudicium vocabitur sine corpore, cum de sui & corporis contubernio ratio præstanda sit? S. Ambros. de Fide Resur.

a 2 Cor. 5, 10.

Further

Furthermore beside the principles of which we consist, and the actions which flow from us, the consideration of the things without us, and the naturall course of variations in the creature, will render the *Resurrection* yet more highly probable. Every space of 24. hours teacheth thus much, in which there is alwayes a revolution amounting to a *Resurrection*. The * day dyes into a night, and is buried in silence and in darknesse; in the next morning it appeareth again and reviveth, opening the grave of darknesse, rising from the dead of night; this is a diurnall *Resurrection*.

* Dies moritur in noctem, & tenebris usquequaque sepelitur. Funestatur mundi honor, omnis

substantia denigratur; Sordent, silent, stupent cuncta; ubique justitium est, quies rerum: ita lux amissa lugetur. Et tamen rursus cum suo cultu, cum dote, cum sole, eadem & integra & rota universo orbi reviviscit, interficiens mortem suam noctem, rescindens sepulchram suam tenebras, hæres sibimet existens, donec & nox reviviscat, cum suo & illa suggestu. Redaccenduntur enim & stella um radii, quos inæutina succensio extinxerat. Reducuntur & siderum absentia, quas temporalis distinctio exemerat. Redornantur & specula Lunæ quæ menstruus numerus adtriverat, *Tertullian. de R. resurrectione carnis*, cap. 12. Lux quotidie interfecta resplendet & tenebræ pari vice decedendo succedunt, sidera defuncta vivescunt, tempora ubi finiuntur incipiunt, tractus consummantur & redeunt, *Idem Apol. cap. 48.* Δύει ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ τὰ πάντα ἀνιπτόμεθα ἵδον τὸ ὄπλον καὶ μισθὸν ἀνιπτόμεθα, ἀνατέλλει ἡ ἡμέρα ἡμᾶς διὰ πύλινον καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπαυξάνουσι τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν, *Epiphani. in Ancorato.*

As the day dyes into night, so doth the Summer into Winter: the sap is said to descend into the root, and there it lyes buried in the ground; the earth is covered with snow, or crufted with frost, and becomes a generall sepulchre; when the Spring appeareth all begin to rise, the plants and flowers peep out of their graves, revive, and grow and flourish; this is the annuall *Resurrection*. The Corn by which we live, and for want of which we perish with famine, is notwithstanding cast upon the earth, and buried in the ground, with a design that it may corrupt, and being corrupted may revive and multiply; our bodies are fed with this constant experiment, and we continue this present life by a succession of *Resurrections*. Thus all things

B b b b b 2

are

are repaired by corrupting, are preserved by perishing and revive by dying; and can we † think that man, the Lord of all these things which thus dye and revive for him, should be detained in death as never to live again? Is it imaginable that God should thus restore all things to man, and not restore man to himself? If there were no other consideration, but of the principles of humane nature, of the liberty and remunerability of humane actions, and of the naturall revolutions and resurrections of other creatures, it were abundantly sufficient to render the Resurrection of our bodies highly probable.

† Omnia pereundo servantur, omnia de intellectu reformatantur Tu homo, tantum nomen, si intelligas te vel de titulo Pythiæ discens, dominus omnium morientium & resurgentium ad hoc morieris ut pereas? *Tertull. Apolog. cap. 48.* Revolvuntur hyemes & æstates, & verna aut autumnæ cum suis viribus, moribus, fructibus. Quippe et a terra de cælo disciplina est arbores vestire post spolia, flores denovo colorare, herbas rursus imponere, exhibere eadem quæ absumpta sunt semina, nec prius exhibere quam absumpta. Mira ratio de fraudatrice servatrix, ut reddat intercipit, ut custodiat perdit, ut integret vitiat, ut etiam amplius prius deperit. Siquidem uberiora & cultiora restituit quam extremavit: revera favore interitu, & injuria usura, & lucro damno: semel dixerim, universa conditio recidiva est. Quodcumque conveneris fuit, quodcumque amiseris nihil non iterum est: omnia in statum redeunt cum abscellerint, omnia incipiunt cum desierint: ideo finiuntur ut fiant, nihil deperit nisi in salutem. Totus igitur hic ordo revolvibilis rerum testatio est resurrectionis mortuorum. Operibus eam præscripsit Deus ante quam literis, viribus prædicavit antequam verbis. Præmisit tibi Naturam magistratam, submissurus & Prophetiam, quod facilius credas prophetiæ discipulus naturæ; quo statim admittas cum audieris, quod ubique jam videris, nec dubites Deum carnis etiam resuscitatore, quem omnium nobis restitutorum. Et ut que omnia homini reurgunt cui procurata sunt porro non homini nisi & carni, quale est ut ipsa deperiat in totum propter quam & cui nihil deperit? *Idem de Resur. carnis, cap. 12.*

We must not rest in this School of Nature, nor settle our persuasions upon likelyhoods; but as we passed from an apparent possibility, unto a high presumption and probability, so must we passe from thence unto a full assurance of an infallible certainty. And of this indeed we cannot be assured but by the Revelation of the will of God; upon his power we must conclude that we may, from his will that we shall, rise from the dead. Now the power of God

is known to all men, and therefore all men may infer from thence a possibility, but the will of God is not revealed unto all men, and therefore all have not an infallible certainty of the Resurrection. For the grounding of which assurance, I shall shew that God hath revealed the determination of his will to raise the dead, and that he hath not onely delivered that intention in his word, but hath also severall wayes confirmed the same.

Many of the places produced out of the Old Testament to this purpose will scarce amount to a Revelation of this truth. The *Jewes* insit upon such weak inferences out of the Law, as shew that the Resurrection was not clearly delivered by *Moses*; and in the book of *Job* where it is most evidently expressed, they acknowledge it not, because they will not understand the true notion of a Redeemer properly belonging to Christ. The words of *Job* are very express, *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.* Against the evidence of this truth there are two Interpretations, one very new of some late Opinionists, who understand this of a suddain restitution to his former temporall condition; the other more ancient of the *Jewes*, who make him speak of the happinesse of another life without any reference to a resurrection. But

* They produce severall places out of *Moses*, which when the Resurrection is believed may in some kind serve to illustrate it, but can in no degree be thought to reveal so great a Mystery. As because in the formation of man *Moses* useth the word *אֶרֶץ* with two jobs, and in the formation

of beasts *אֶרֶץ* with but one; therefore the beasts are made but once, but man twice, once in his generation, and again in his Resurrection. They strongly apprehend a promise of the Resurrection, even in the *Malediction*. Dust thou art and to dust thou shalt return; *אֶרֶץ תָּשׁוּבָה אֲדָמָה*; it is not thou shalt go to the dust, but thou shalt return. As if he had said, thou art now dust while thou livest, and after death thou shalt return unto this dust, that is, thou shalt live again, as now thou dost. So from these words *Exod. 15. 1. אֶרֶץ תָּשׁוּבָה אֲדָמָה*, they conclude the resurrection, upon this ground *אֶרֶץ תָּשׁוּבָה אֲדָמָה*, it is not said he sang, but he shall sing, viz after the resurrection in a life to come. With these and we like Arguments did the *Rabins* satisfy themselves, which was the reason that they gave so small satisfaction to the *Sadducees*; while they omitted that pregnant place in *Job*. *Job 19. 25. 26.*

B b b b b 3 that

that *Job* spake not concerning any suddain restitution, or any alteration of his temporall condition, is apparent out of the remarkable preface ushering in this expression, *O that my words were now written, O that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead, in the rock for ever!* He desires that his words may continue as long as his expectation, that they may remain in the rock, together with his hope so long as the rock shall endure, even to the day of his resurrection. The same appeareth from the objection of his friends, who urged against him that he was a sinner, and concluded from thence that he should never rise again; for his sins he pleadeth a Redeemer, and for his resurrection he sheweth expectation and assurance through the same Redeemer. It is further confirmed by the expressions themselves, which are no way proper for his temporall restitution: the first words *I also know*, denote a certainty and a community, whereas the blessings of this life are under no such certainty; nor did *Job* pretend to it, and the particular condition of *Job* admitted no community, there being none partaker with him of the same calamity, *I know* certainly and infallibly, whatsoever shall become of my body at this time, which I know not, but this I know that I shall rise; this is the hope of all which believe in God, and therefore this *I also know*. The title which he gives to him on whom he depends, the Redeemer sheweth that he understands it of Christ; the time expressed denotes the futuration at the latter day, the description of that Redeemer, *standing on the earth*, representeth the Judge of the quick and the dead, and seeing God with his eyes, declares his belief in the Incarnation. The Jewish exposition of future happiness to be conferred by God, fails onely in this that they will not see in this place the promised *Messias*, from whence this future happy condition which they allow would clearly involve a Resurrection. Howsoever they acknowledge the words of *Daniel* to de-

clare

clare as much, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting confusion.

Dan. 12. 2.
The Jewes col-
led from hence
the Resurrecti-

on, as Rabinai in Sanhedrin. and in the Midrash Tillim, Psal. 93. 3. *אֲדָמָה וְרֵבִים מִשְׁנֵי אֲדָמָה טָפַר יִקְצֹוּ וְגו'*
Rabbi Rachinon said, that the sleepers in the dust are the dead, as it is written, Dan. 12. 2. Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, &c. And this is onely aemied by the Gentiles; for Porphyrius referreth it onely and wholly to the times of Antiochus, whose words are thus left unto us translated by S. Hierome, Tunc hi qui quasi in terræ pulvere dormiebant, & operiti erant malorum pondere, & quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad insperatam victoriam de terræ pulvere resurrexerunt, & de humo elevaverunt caput, custodes legis resurgentes in vitam æternam, & prævaricatores in opprobrium sempiternum, & he it is to be observed that he gives a probabl. glosse of the former part of the verse, but none at all of the latter, because it is no way consistent with his exposition of the former, for they which did rise from the burden of the pressures under Antiochus, did neither rise from thence to an eternall life, nor to an everlasting contempt.

If these and other places of the old Testament shew that God had then revealed his will to raise the dead; we are sure those of the New fully declare the same. Christ, who called himself *the Resurrection and the life*, refuted the Sadduces, and confirmed the doctrine of the Pharisees as to that opinion. He produced a place out of the Law of Moses, and made it an Argument to prove as much, *As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living.* With the force of which Argument the multitude was astonished and the Sadduces silenced. For under the name of God was understood a great benefactor, a God of promise, and to be their God was to blesse them and to reward them, as in them to be his servants and his people was to believe in him, and to obey him. Now Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had not received the promises which they expected, and therefore God after their death desiring still to be called their God, he thereby acknowledgeth that he

Mat. 22. 32.

Exod. 6. 4.

לחת לנכם לא

נאמר אלכם

להם מנא

לחת

החתים מן

: תתורה

It is

not said to give

you, but to

give them,

whereby the

Resurrection of

the dead appea-

reth out of the

Law, R. Simai

in Perak He

lek. and th. re

fore the Jewes

hold the Resur-

rection for one

of the foundati-

ons of the law

of Moses,

ותחיות

המתים

קאעיה מן

קאעיה

שריעה משנ:

Moses Maim.

Expl. cap. 10.

Tract. Sane-

drin.

a Añ. 23. 6.

b Añ. 24. 21.

he had a blessing and a reward for them still, and consequently that he will raise them to another life in which they may receive it. So that the Argument of our Saviour is the same which the Jewes have drawn from another place of *Moses*, I appeared unto *Abraham*, unto *Isaac* and unto *Jacob* by the name of God Almighty, but by my name *Jehovah* was I not known to them. Nevertheless I have established my Covenant with them, to give them the land of *Canaan*, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers. It is not said to give their sons, but to give them the land of *Canaan*; and therefore, because while they lived here they enjoy'd it not, they must live again that they may receive the promise. And as our blessed Saviour did refute the Sadduces out of the Law of *Moses*, so did *S. Paul* joyn himself unto the Pharisees in this particular, for being called before the Council, and perceiving that the one part were Sadduces and the other Pharisees, one denying, the other asserting the resurrection, ^a he cryed out unto the Council, Men and brethren I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question; and answering before *Felix*, that they had found no evil doing in him, while he stood before the Council he mentioned this particularly, ^b except it be for this one voice that I cryed standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead, I am called in question by you this day. It is evident therefore that the Resurrection of the dead was revealed under the Law, that the Pharisees who sat in *Moses* chair did collect it from thence, and believe it before our Saviour came into the world, that the Sadduces who denied it, erred, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God: that our blessed Saviour clearly delivered the same truth, proved it out of the Law of *Moses*, refuted the Sadduces, confirmed the Pharisees, taught it the Apostles, who followed him confirming it to the Jewes preaching it to the Gentiles. Thus the will of God concerning the

the raising the dead was made known unto the Sons of men; and because God can doe whatsoever he will, and will certainly effect whatsoever he hath foretold, therefore we are assured of a Resurrection by virtue of a clear Revelation.

Beside God hath not onely foretold, or barely promised, but hath also given such testimonies as are most proper to confirm our faith in this particular prediction and promise. For God heard the voyce of *Elisha* for the dead child of the widow of *Sarepta*, *and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived.* Him did *Elisha* succeed, not onely in the same spirit, but also in the like power, for he raised the child of the *Shunamite* from death; nor did that power dye together with him; for when they were burying a dead man, *they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha, and when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet.* These three examples were so many confirmations, under the Law, of a resurrection to life after death; and we have three to equall them under the Gospel. When the daughter of *Jairus* was dead, *Christ said unto her, Talitha cumi, Damsel arise, and her spirit came again, and straightway the Damsel arose and walked.* When he came nigh to the gate of the city called *Naim*, there was a dead man carried out, and he came nigh, and touched the bier, and said, *Young man, I say unto thee, Arise; and he that was dead sat up and began to speak.* Thus Christ raised the dead in the chamber and in the street, from the bed and from the bier, and not content with these smaller demonstrations, proceedeth also to the grave. When *Lazarus* had bin dead four dayes, and so buried that his sister said of him, *by this time he stinketh,* Jesus cryed with a loud voice; *Lazarus come forth, and he that was dead came forth.* These three Evangelicall resuscitations are so many preambulatory proofs of the last and generall Resurrection; but the three former and these also come far short of

1 King. 17. 22.

2 King. 4.

2 King 17. 21.

Mar. 5. 41, 42.

Luc. 8. 55.

Luc. 7. 12,

14, 15.

Joh. 11. 39,

43, 44.

the Resurrection of him, who raised these.

Christ did of himself actually rise, others which had slept in their graves did come from thence, and thus he gave an actuall testimony of the Resurrection. For if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, saith S. Paul to the Corinthians, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? If it be most infallibly certain that one man did rise from the dead, as we have before proved that Christ did, then it must be as certainly false to assert that there is no resurrection. And therefore when the Gentiles did themselves confesse that some particular persons did return † to life after death, they could not rationally deny the Resurrection wholly. Now the resurrection of Christ doth not onely prove by way of example, as the rest who rose, but hath a force in it to command belief of a future generall Resurrection. For God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. All men then are assured that they shall rise, because Christ is risen. And b since by man came death; by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all dye, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

† There were not onely certain persons under the Law & among the Jews who were raised to life; but there were also Histories amongst the Gentiles of severall who rose to life after death. We mentioned before one out of Plutarch pag. 528. who rose the third day, and Plato mentioneth another who revived the twelfth day after death.

This consequence of a future Resurrection of the dead from that of Christ already past, either hath a generall or a particular consideration. In a generall reference it concerneth all, in a more peculiar way it belongeth to the Elect alone. First, it belongeth generally unto all men in respect of that Dominion which Christ at

Αλλ' ἔμψυχοι σσι, ἦν δ' ἐγὼ, Ἀλλήκου γε ἀπόλογον ἔρω, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνδρως, Ἡδὲ τῷ Ἀρμινίῳ, τὸ γένος Παμφύλου, ὅς ποτε ἐν πολέμῳ τελευτήσας αἰχμαριδιῶντων δεκαταίων τῶν νεκρῶν ἦδη διαφθερμύων, ὑγιᾶς μὲν ἀνῆλθεν, κομιθεὶς δ' οὐκ ἐλάττω μίλλων διακρίσται δεκαταίῳ ἐπὶ τῇ πυρρᾷ κήμῳ ἀναβίω, Plato de Repub. l. 10. vide Plin. lib. 7. cap. 52. De his qui elati revixerunt.

a. Act. 17. 31.

b. 1. Cor. 15. 21, 22.

his

his resurrection did obtain. *For to this end Christ both dy-* Rom. 14. 9.

ed and rose, and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. Now as God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, so Christ is not the Lord of the dead, as dead, but as by his power he can revive them, and rule them when and in what they live. By virtue of this dominion obtained at his Resurrection he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet, and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and there is no destruction of death but by a generall Resurrection. By virtue of this did he declare himself after this manner to S. John, I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen, and have the keyes of hell and of death. Thus are we assured of a generall Resurrection, in that Christ is risen to become the Lord of the dead, and to destroy death. 1 Cor. 15. 25, 26.

Rev. 1. 18.

Secondly, Christ rising from the dead assureth us of a Generall Resurrection in respect of the Judgement which is to follow. For as it is appointed for all men once to dye, so after death cometh judgement; and as Christ was raised that he might be Judge, so shall the dead be raised that they may be judged. As therefore God gave an assurance to all men that he would judge the world by that man, in that he raised him from the dead, so by the same act did he also give an assurance of the resurrection of the world to judgement.

Now as the Generall Resurrection is evidenced by the rising of Christ, so in a more especiall and peculiar manner the Resurrection of the chosen Saints and servants of God is demonstrated thereby. For he is risen not onely as their Lord and Judge, but as their Head, to which they are united as members of his body (for he is the Head of the body the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead;) as the first-fruits, by which all the lump is sanctified and accepted, for now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that sleep. The Coloss. 1. 18.

1 Cor. 15. 20.

Rom. 8. II.

Saints of God are endued with the Spirit of Christ, and thereby their bodies become the temples of the Holy Ghost; now as the promise of the Spirit was upon the resurrection of Christ, so the gift and possession of the Spirit is an assurance of the resurrection of a Christian. For if *the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortall bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in us.* Thus God hath determined, and revealed that determination, to raise the dead, and confirmed that revelation by the actual raising of severall persons as examples, and of Christ as the highest assurance which could be given unto man, that the doctrine of the Resurrection might be established beyond all possibility of contradiction. Wherefore I conclude that *the Resurrection of the body,* is in it self considered possible, upon generall considerations highly probable, upon Christian principles infallibly certain.

But as it is necessary to a Resurrection that the flesh should rise, neither will the life of the soul alone continuing amount to the reviviscence of the whole man, so it is also necessary that the same flesh should be rais'd again; for if either the same body should be joyned to another soul, or the same soul united to another body, it would not be the resurrection of the same man. Now the soul is so eminent a part of man, and by our Saviours testimony not subject to mortality, that it never entred into the thoughts of any man to conceive that men should rise again with other souls. If the spirits of men departed live, as certainly they doe, and when the Resurrection should be perform'd, the bodies should be inform'd with other souls; neither they which liv'd before then should revive, and those which live after the resurrection should have never bin before. Wherefore being at the latter day we expect not a new creation but a restitution, not a propagation but a renovation, not a production of new souls, but

but a reunion of such as before were separated, there is no question but the same soules should live the second life which have lived the first. Nor is this onely true of our souls, but must be also made good of our bodies, those houses of clay, those habitations of flesh: as our bodies while we live are really distinguished from all other creatures, as the body of every particular man is different from the bodies of all other men, as no other substance whatsoever is vitally united to the soul of that man whose body it is while he liveth, so no substance of any other creature, no body of other man shall be vitally reunited unto the soul at the Resurrection.

That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life which dyed, that the same flesh which was separated from the soul at the day of death shall be united to the soul at the last day, that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be reared up again, that the same temple which was destroyed shall be re-built, is most apparent out of the same Word, most evident upon the same grounds upon which we believe there shall be any Resurrection. *Though after my skin wormes destroy this body,* Job 19. 26, 27. *saith Job, yet in my flesh, (in flesh shewing the reality, in my flesh shewing the propriety and identity) shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another or a stranger eye. He that raised up Christ* Rom. 8. 11. *from the dead shall also quicken our mortall bodies; after the Resurrection our glorified bodies shall become spiri- tuall and incorruptible, but in the resurrection of our mor- tall bodies, those bodies, by reason of whose mortality* 1 Cor. 15. 53. *we dyed, shall be revived. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortall must put on immortality.* *But* βασιλείαν

Θεὸς ἐκκληρονομήσει, νομίσει τὰ σώματα καὶ ἀνίστασθαι, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ, ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ φθαρτὸν οὗτο ἐνδύσεται ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν οὗτο ἐνδύσεται ἀθανασία, φθαρ- τὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ θνητὸν τὸ σῶμα. ὅτι τὸ μὲν σῶμα μίση, αὐτὸ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐνδύμενον· ἡ δὲ θνητότης καὶ ἡ φθορὰ ἀρνούμενη, ἀθανασία καὶ ἀφθαρσία ἐπι- θέσθαι αὐτῇ, S. Chrysost. ad locum. Ὁμοίως τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τὸ θνητὸν οὗτο

ἡ δὲ σαρκὶς ἵνα μὴ ἄλλως νομισθῇ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, Theodoretus ibid. *Oportet enim corruptivum istud induere incorruptionem, & mortale istud induere immortalitatem.* Quid mortale nisi caro? quid corruptivum nisi sanguis? Ac ne putes aliquid aliud sentire Apostolum providentem tibi, & ut de carne dictum intelligas laborantem, cum dicit *istud corruptivum & istud mortale* cutem ipsam tenens dicit. Certe *istud* nisi de subjecto, nisi de componenti pronuntiasse non potuit: demonstrationis corporalis est verbum, *Tertull. de Resur. carnis*, cap. 51. Sed & Apostolus cum dicit, *Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, & mortale hoc induere immortalitatem*: numquid non corpus suum quodammodo contingens & digito palantis est vox? Hoc ergo quod nunc corruptibile corpus est, resurrectiōis gratia incorruptibile est, & nunc quod mortale est immortalitati virtutibus induetur, *Ruff. in Symb.* Quod dicit Apostolus *Corruptibile hoc & mortale*; hoc ipsum corpus, id est, carnem, quæ tunc videbatur ostendit. Quod autem copulat *Induere incorruptionem & immortalitatem*; illud indumentum, id est, vestimentum, non dicit corpus abolere quod ornat in gloria, sed quod ante inglorium fuit efficere gloriosum, *S. Hieron. Epist. 61. ad Eummachium.*

But *this corruptible* and *this mortall* is the same bodie which dyeth, because *mortall*, and is corrupted because *corruptible*; the soul then at the resurrection of that man which is made immortall must put on that body which putteth on incorruption and immortality.

The identity of the body rais'd from death is so necessary, that the very name of the Resurrection doth include or suppose it; so that when I say there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much, that the bodies of men which lived and are dead shall revive & rise again. For at the death of man nothing † falleth but his body, the *spirit goeth upward*, and no other body falleth but his own, and therefore the body, and no other but that body, must rise again to make a Resurrection. If we look upon

† Περὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως
 πῶς ἐστὶν σαρκὸς ἔσχατος ἀνάστασις, ὡς ἐντε-
 λούσθαι τὴν ἰδέαν
 αὐτῇ γὰρ ὁνομασία τῆς
 φράσεως δι-
 κνυσί τῶν δι-
 ναμῶν. Ἀνάστα-

στὰς τὸς καλὰν) τῇ μὲν παλαιᾷ κατὰ τὸν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ πρῶτον; ποῖον τὸ πρῶτον; ποῖον τὸ δεύτερον, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ σῶμα; καὶ ἔχῃ ψυχὴν, ψυχὴν τοῦ σώματος ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀποθανῆτος, Epiphân. Har. 67. §. 6. Nam & ipsum quod *Mortuorum Resurrectio* dicitur exigit defendi proprietates vocabulorum. *Mortuorum* itaque vocabulo non est nisi quod amisit animam, de cujus facultate vivebat. Corpus est quod amittit animam, & amittendo fit mortuum; ita morui vocabulum corpori comperit. Porro si resurrectio mortui est, mortuum autem non aliud est quam corpus, corporis erit resurrectio. Sic & *Resurrectionis* vocabulum non aliam rem vindicat quam quæ cecidit. Surgere enim potest dici & quod omnino non cecidit, quod semper

retro jacuit. Resurgere autem non est nisi ejus quod cecidit. Iterum enim sur-
gendo quia cecidit resurgere dicitur. Re enim syllaba iterationi semper adhibetur, Tertull. advers. Marcion. lib. 5. cap. 9. Sed & ipsum Resurrectionis vocabulum significat non aliud ruere, aliud resuscitari; & quod adjicitur Mortuorum carnem propriam demonstrat; quod enim in homine moritur hoc & vivificatur, S. Hieronym. Epist. 61.

upon it under the notion of Reviviscency, which is more ordinary in the † Hebrew language, it proves as much, for † The Rabbins nothing properly dyeth but the body, the soul cannot be killed, and nothing can revive but that which dyeth. Or to speak more punctually, The man falleth not in respect of his spirit but of his flesh, and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell; man dyeth not in inference to his soul, which is immortall, but his body, and therefore he cannot be said to revive, but in reference to his body before depriv'd of life; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body dyed but his own, therefore he cannot rise again but in his own flesh, he cannot revive again but in his own body.

u'e sometimes
הקומה which
is properly re-
surrection &
resans, ac-
cording to that
of our Saviour
Talitha cumi:
but more often
they make use of
החיה, which
is reviviscencia
or vivifications.
And though
they make a

distinction sometimes between them, attributing the first to the wicked, the second to the just, yet it must not so be understood as if there could be a Reviviscency without a Resurrection, a *החיה* without a *הקומה*, but that there is to the wicked a *הקומה*, which cannot so properly be called *החיה*, because they rise not to the happiness of eternall life.

Again, the description of the place from whence the Resurrection shall begin is a sufficient assurance that the same bodies which were dead shall revive and rise again. They which sleep in the dust of the earth, they which are in the graves shall hear the voice and arise: the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and the grave deliver up the dead which are in them. But if the same bodies did not rise, they which are in the dust should not revive; if God should give us any other bodies then our own, neither the sea nor the grave should give up their dead. That shall rise again which the grave gives up; the grave.

Dan. 12. 2.
Joh. 5. 28.
Rev. 20. 13.

grave hath nothing else to give up but that body which was laid into it; therefore the same body which is buried at the last day shall be revived.

2 Cor. 5. 10. The immediate consequent of the Resurrection proveth the identity of the dying and rising body, *We must all appear before the Judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad.* That which shall

† Quam absurdum, quam vero & iniquum, utrumque autem quam Deo indignum, aliam substantiam operari, aliam mercede dispensari, ut hæc quidem caro per martyria sanctetur, alia vero coronetur: item è contrario hæc quidem caro in spurcitiis voluntetur, alia vero damnetur?

be then received is either a reward or punishment, a reward for the good, a punishment for the evil, done in the body; that which shall receive the reward, and be lyable to the punishment, is not onely the soul but the body; it stands not therefore with the nature of a † just retribution, that he which sinned in one body should be punished in another, he which pleased God in his own flesh should see God with other eyes. As for the wicked, God shall *destroy both their soul and body in hell*: but they which *glorify God in their body and their spirit which are God's*, shall be glorified by God in their body and their spirit, for they are both *bought* with the same price, even the blood of Christ. The bodies of the Saints are the *members of Christ*, and no members of his shall remain in death: they are the *temples of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore if they be destroyed they shall be raised again. For *if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us*, as he doth, and by so dwelling maketh our bodies temples, *in which raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.*

Nonne præstat omnem semel fidem à spe Resurrectionis abducere, quam de gravitate atque justitia Dei ludere; Marcionem pro Valentino resuscitari? Ter-
tull. de Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 56. a Math. 10. 28. b 1 Cor.
rinth. 6. 20. c 1 Corinth. 6. 15, 19. d Rom. 8. 11.

Furthermore, the identity of the dying and the rising body will appear by those bodies which shall never rise because they shall never dye. Those whom Christ shall find

find alive at his coming, he shall not kill but change; *the dead in Christ shall rise first, then they which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall ever be with the Lord.* If those which are alive shall be caught up as they are alive with the same bodies, onely changed into glorified and spirituall bodies, that is with the same bodies spiritualized and glorified; certainly those which were dead shall rise out of their graves to life in the same bodies in which they lived, that they may both appear alike before the *Judge of the quick and the dead.*

Lastly, those examples which God hath bin pleased to give us to confirm our faith in the Resurrection, do at the same time perswade us that the same body which dyed shall rise again. For whether we look upon the three Examples of the Old Testament or those of the New, they all rose in the same body before it was dissolved: if we look upon those which rose upon our Saviour's death; it is written, that *the graves were opened, and many bodies of Saints which slept arose and came out of their graves*, certainly the same bodies which were layed in. If then they were to us *examples of the Resurrection to come, as * *Post dicta Domini facta etiam ejus quid sapere credamus de capu-*

lis, de sepulchris mortuos resuscitantis? cui rei istud? si ad simplicem ostentationem potestatis, aut ad præsentem gratiã redanimationis, non adeo magnum illi denovo morituros suscitare. Enimvero si ad fidem porius sequestrandum futuræ resurrectionis, ergo & illa corporalis præscribitur de documentis sui forma Tertul. de Res. car. c. 38. Argo Deum magno decipere non posse, de fallacia solummodo infirmis ne aliter documenta præmississe quam remidisse videtur, imo ne si exemplum resurrectionis sine carne non valuit inducere, multo magis plenitudinem exempli in eadem substantia exhibere non possit. Nullum vero exemplum majus est eo cuius exemplum est. Majus est autem si animæ cum corpore resuscitabuntur in documentum sine corpore relinquenti, ut tota hominis salus dimidiata patrocineretur; quando exemplorum conditio istud potius expeceret quod minus haberetur, animæ dico solius resurrectionem, velut gustum carnis resurrectionis suo in tempore, Ibidem.

D d d d d

rest

Joh. 1. 19.

Phil. 3. 21.

Luc. 24. 39.

rest shall rise. And being Christ himself did raise his own body, according to his prediction *Destroy this Temple and in three dayes I will raise it up*, and declared it to be his own body, saying. *Behold my hands and my feet that it is I my self, being he shall change our vile bodies that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body*, it followeth that we shall rise in the same bodies as our Saviour did, that every particular person at the Resurrection may speak the words which Christ then spake, *Behold it is I my self*.

Having hitherto proved the Certainty of this Article, that there shall be a *Resurrection*, and declared the Verity and Propriety of it, that it shall be the *Resurrection* of the same body which was dead; we may now proceed further to enquire into the Latitude of the same, to whom the Resurrection doth belong. And here we find a great difference between the Revelation of this truth under the Law and under the Gospel; Christ proved out of the Law that there should be a Resurrection, but by such an argument as reacheth no further then unto the people of God, because it is grounded upon those words, *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob*. Job speaketh most expressly of the Resurrection, but mentioneth no other then his Redeemer and himself. The place of *Daniel*, which was alwayes accounted the most evident and uncontradicted testimony, though it deliver two different sorts of persons rising, yet it seems to be with some limitation, *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake*. From whence the *Jewes* most generally have believed that some men should live again and some should not, because it is written *Many shall awake*, but it is not written *All shall awake*. Nay some of them have gone so far by way of restriction, that they have maintained a resurrection of the Just alone, according to that ancient saying accepted amongst them, that the *Sending of the Rain is of the just and unjust, but the Resurrection of the dead is*

* This is recorded in the *Pesherit Rabba*. Vide *Maimonidis Expl. 10. cap. Tract. anbedrin*.

of the just alone. Against which two Restrictions by the light delivered in the Gospel we shall deliver the latitude of this Article in these two Propositions. First, The Resurrection of the dead belongeth not unto the just alone, but to the unjust also. Secondly, The Resurrection of the dead belongeth not onely to some of the just, but to all the just, not to some of the unjust onely, but to all the unjust, even unto all the dead.

For the first it is most evident not onely out of the New but also out of the Old Testament. The words of *Daniel* prove it sufficiently, for of those *many* which shall awake, some shall rise to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. But it is most certain that the just shall never rise to shame and everlasting contempt; therefore it is most evident that some shall awake and rise beside the Just. The *Jewes* themselves did understand and believe thus much, as appeareth by *S. Paul's* Apology *Act. 24. 15.* to *Felix*, *But this I confesse unto thee, that I have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just & unjust.* The just shall rise to receive their reward, the unjust to receive their punishment; the first unto a Resurrection, called in reference unto them, *the Resurrection of life*; the second unto a Resurrection, named in relation unto them, *the Resurrection of damnation.* For as there is *a Resurrection of the just*, so there must also be *a Resurrection of the unjust*: that as *Christ* said unto the charitable person, *Thou shalt be blessed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just*; so it may be said to the wicked and uncharitable, *thou shalt be accursed, for thou shalt be recompensed at the Resurrection of the unjust.* For there shall be a Resurrection that there may be a Judgement, and at the Judgement there shall appear sheep on the right hand of the Son of man, and goats on the left, therefore they both shall rise, those that they may receive that blessing, *Come ye blessed of my Father,*

D d d d d 2 inhe-

Joh. 5. 29.
Ἀνάστασις
ζωῆς, & Ἀνά-
στασις ὀπίσω.
The first is cal-
led ἀνάστασις
ζωῆς, and
therefore the se-
cond may as
well be called
ἀνάστασις ὀπί-
σω.
a Luc. 14. 14.

Mat. 25. 34.

41.

inherit the kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world, these that they may receive that sentence, *Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his Angels*. At that Resurrection then which we believe there shall rise both just and unjust.

1 Cor. 15. 22.

21.

Joh. 5. 28.

Mat. 25. 32.

Rom. 14. 10.

2 Cor. 5. 10.

Secondly, as no kind of men, so no person shall be excluded: whosoever dyeth is numbred with the just or unjust. *Adam* the first of men shall rise, and all which come from him. *For as in Adam all dyed, so in Christ shall all be made alive*. Christ is the Lord of the dead, and so hath a right by that dominion to raise them all to life: it is called *the Resurrection of the dead* indefinitely, and comprehendeth them universally. *By man came death, by man came the Resurrection of the dead*, and so the Resurrection adequately answereth unto death. Christ shall destroy death, but if any one should be left still dead, death were not destroyed. The words of our Saviour are expresse and full, *The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the Resurrection of damnation*. In the description of the Judgement which followeth upon the Resurrection, *when the Son of man shall sit upon the Throne of his glory*, it is said that *before him shall be gathered all nations*. *We shall all stand before the Judgement seat of Christ*, and if so, the dead must all rise, for they all are fallen. *We must all appear before the Judgement seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil*; and before we all appear the dead must rise that they may appear. This is the latitude of the Resurrection; the Resurrection of the dead is the Resurrection of all the dead.

Now this Resurrection, as an object of our faith, is yet to come; and we are obliged to believe the futurity of it.

There

There were Hereticks in the Apostles dayes who acknowledged a Resurrection, but yet destroyed this Article, by denying the relation of it to the time to come, as *Hymeneus and Philetus, who erred concerning the truth, saying that the Resurrection is past already, and so overthrow the faith of some.* To believe it already past is to deny it, because it cannot be believed past but by such an interpretation as must destroy it. As they which interpret this Resurrection of the likeness of Christ's Resurrection; that as he dyed and rose again, so we should dye unto sin and live again unto righteousness, attributing all to the renovation of the mind, must deny *the resurrection of the body.*

catur, arbitrati sunt jam factam esse resurrectionem, nec ullam ulterius in fine temporum esse sperandam. *Ex quibus est, inquit, Hymeneus & Philetus, qui circa veritatem aberraverunt, dicentes resurrectionem jam factam esse.* Idem Apostolus eos arguens detestatur, qui tamen dicit nos surrexisse cum Christo, *S. Aug. Epist. 119. ad Januarium. This was the Heresie of the Seleuciani or Hermiani, as the same Aug. testifieth, Hær. 39.* Resurrectionem non putant futuram, sed quotidie fieri in generatione filiorum. *Thus Tertullian relates of some Hereticks in his time, who made the Resurrection wholly Allegoricall, and yet pretended to believe a Resurrection in the flesh, but understood it in this life, at the Baptismall renovation, and so past when they professed to believe.* Exinde ergo Resurrectionem fide consecutos cum Domino esse; cum eum in Baptismo induerint. Hoc denique ingenio etiam in colloquiis sæpe nostros decipere consueverunt, quasi & ipsi resurrectionem carnis admittant. Væ, inquit, qui non in hac carne surrexit, ne statim illos percutiant, si resurrectionem statim abnuerint: tacite autem secundum conscientiam suam hoc sentiunt. Væ qui non, dum in hac carne est, cognoverit arcana hæretica, hoc enim apud illos resurrectio, *Tertull de Resurrect. Carnis, cap. 19.*

Now as we know the doctrine of the Resurrection was first delivered to be believed as to come; so we are assured that it is not yet come since the doctrine of it was first delivered, and is to be believed as to come to the end of the world; because, as *Martha* called it, it is the *Resurrection at the last day.* *Job* who knew that his Redeemer lived, did not expect that he should stand upon the earth till the *latter day*; Christ hath no otherwise declared his

2 Tim. 2. 18.

Nonnulli attendentes verba quæ assidue dicit Apostolus, *Quia & mortui sumus cum Christo, & resurreximus cum eo; nec intelligentes*

quatenus dica-

tendentes verba quæ assidue dicit Apostolus, *Quia & mortui sumus cum Christo, & resurreximus cum eo; nec intelligentes*

Joh. 11. 24.

Joh. 6. 39.

Fathers will, then that of all which he hath given him, he should loose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.

Mat. 13. 39.

The corn is sown and laid in the ground, and the harvest is the end of the world.

1 Cor. 15. 52.

We must not expect to rise from the dead till the last trump. The Lord himself shall descend

1 Theff. 4. 16.

from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an Archangel and with the trump of God before all that are in the graves

Act. 17. 31.

shall hear his voice. God shall judge the world; and therefore

Joh. 5. 28.

shall raise the world: but he will not raise them to that judgement till the end of the world.

Thus having demonstrated that the will of God hath bin revealed that there should be a Resurrection; that the Resurrection which was revealed is the Resurrection of the body; that the bodies which are to be raised are the same which are already dead or shall hereafter dye, that this Resurrection is not past, but that we which live shall hereafter attain unto it; I conceive I have declared all which is necessary by way of explication and confirmation of the truth of this Article.

The Value of this Truth, the Necessity of this doctrine will appear; First, in the illustration of the Glory of God, by the most lively demonstration of his Wisdom, Power, Justice, and Mercy. God first created all things, for himself, and the Resurrection is as it were a new Creation. The wisdom and power of God are manifested in this acknowledgement, in as much as without infinite knowledge he could not have an exact and distinct comprehension of all the particles and individuall dusts of all the bodies of all men, & without an infinite power he could not conjoyn, cement, conglutinate and incorporate them again into the same flesh. The Mercy and Justice of God are declared by the same profession; the Mercy, in promising life after that death which we had so justly deserved, the Justice, in performing that promise unto all true believers, and in punishing the disobedient with everlasting flames. *When ye see this, saith the Prophet, your heart shall rejoyce*

rejoyce, and your bones shall flourish like an herb; and the hand of the Lord shall be known towards his servants, and his indignation towards his enemies. Isal. 66. 14.

Secondly, it is necessary to professe the belief of the *Resurrection of the body*, that we may thereby acknowledge the great and powerfull work of our Redemption: confessing that death could not be conquered but by death, and that we could never have obtained another life had not the Saviour of the world *abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.* 2 Tim. 1. 10.
 If Christ were not *the life*, the dead could never live: if he were not *the Resurrection* they could never rise. Were it not for him *that liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore*, had not he *the keyes of hell and of death*, we could never break through the barrs of death, or passe the gates of hell. But he hath undertaken to vanquish our enemies, and our *last enemy to be destroyed is death*: that the prophesie may be fulfilled, *Death is swallowed up in victory,* and we may cry out with the Apostle, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.* Hos. 13. 14.
1 Corin. 15. 54, 57.

Thirdly, the Belief of this Article is necessary to strengthen us against the fear of our own death, and immoderate sorrow for the death of others. The sentence of death passed upon us for our sins cannot but affright and amaze us, except we look upon the suspension, relaxation, or revocation of it in the Resurrection; but when we are assured of a life after death, and such a life as no death shall follow it, we may lay down our fears arising from corrupted nature upon the comforts proceeding from our faith. The departure of our friends might overwhelm us with grief, if they were lost for ever; but the Apostle will *not have us ignorant concerning those which are asleep, that we sorrow not even as others which have no hope.* 1 Theff. 4. 13.

Fourthly, the belief of the Resurrection hath a necessary

sary reflexion upon this life by way of preparation for the next, as deterring from sinne, as encouraging to holinesse, as comforting in afflictions. How can any man commit a deliberate sin while he thinks that he must rise and stand before the Judgement seat, and give an account, and suffer for ever the punishment due unto it? What pleasure can entice him, what inclination can betray him for a momentary satisfaction to incurre an eternall rejection? How can we defile that body which shall never be raised to glory hereafter except it here become the Temple of the Holy Ghost? S. Paul who hath delivered the doctrine, hath taught us by his own example what work is expected to be wrought upon our souls by it. I have hope, saith he, towards God that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust. And
 Act. 24. 15, 16. *herein do I exercise my self to have alwayes a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man.* This is the proper work of a true belief and a full perswasion of a Resurrection; and he which is really possessed with this hope, cannot chuse but purifie himself; *alwayes abound-
 1 Cor. 15. 58. ing in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as he knoweth that his labour is not in vain in the Lord.* This encourageth all drooping spirits, this susteineth all fainting hearts, this sweeteneth all present miseries, this lighteneth all heavy burdens, this encourageth in all dangers, this supporteth in all calamities.

Having thus discovered the truth of this Article; we may easily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and understood to professe, when he confesseth a belief of *the Resurrection of the body*; for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much, I am fully perswaded of this as of a most necessary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to dye, so it is also determined that all men shall rise from death, that the soules separated from our bodies are in the hand of God and live, that the bodies dissolved into dust,

dust, or scattered into ashes, shall be recollected in themselves and reunited to their souls, that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived, that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise, that this resurrection shall be universal, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave, that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation, that this shall be performed at the last day when the Trump shall sound; and thus *I believe the resurrection of the bodies.*

ARTICLE XII.

AND THE LIFE EVERLASTING.

THis last Article though † not to be found in all, yet † *Not in all,* was express'd in * many ancient Creeds. Some by *for divers en-* way of addition, *and the life everlasting*; others by way *ded with that* of conjunction with the former, *the Resurrection of the bo-* *dy unto everlasting life.* Upon this connexion with the *of the Resurre-* *ction, as ap-* *peareth by Ruf-* *former, finis, who not* *only expounded the Aquileian Creed, but collated it with the Greek and Roman,* *and yet makes no mention of this Article, but concludes with that of the Resurrecti-* *on. Sed & ultimus iste sermo, qui resurrectionem carnis pronunciat, summam to-* *tius perfectionis succincta brevitate concludit. And as he cas he shewes the custome* *of the Aquileian Church to make a crosse upon their forehead at the naming of hujus* *carnis, he tells us elsewhere in his Apology against S. Hierome, that it was to con-* *clude the Creed. Quo scilicet fronte, ut mos est in fine Symboli, signaculo con-* *tingentes, & ore carnis hujus, videlicet quam contingimus, resurrectionem fa-* *rentes, omnem venenatæ adversum nos lingue calumniandi aditum præstrua-* *mus. In the same manner S. Hierome his contemporary, In Symbolo fidei & spei* *nostræ, quod ab Apostolis traditum non scribitur in charta & atramento, sed in* *tabulis cordis carnalibus, post confessionem Trinitatis & Unitatem Ecclesiæ om-* *ne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur. S. Maxi-* *mus Taurinensis after these words Carnis resurrectionem, adds, Hic Reli-* *gionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est. And Venantius Fortunatus after the* *same words, summa perfectionis concluditur. And in the Mss. set forth by the Arch-* *bishop of Armagh Capn's ἀνάστασις and carnis resurrectione are the last words.*

* *As Petrus Chrysologus expressly, Credimus vitam æternam, quia post resurrectionem, nec bonorum finis est nec malorum. Signate vos, Serm. 60. and again, Bene addidit vitam æternam, ut se resurrecturum crederet qui resurget per ipsum qui cum Deo Patre & Spiritu S. vivit & regnat. So Etherius Uxamensis, & Eusebius Gillicanus. So we find Serm. de Tempore 131. & De Symbolo ad Catech. lib. 1. Quomodo carnis Resurrectionem? Ne forte paret al quis quomodo Lazari, ut scias non sic esse, additum est in vitam æternam; and lib. 2. Hoc sequitur etiam in S. Symbolo, quod post Resurrectionem carnis credamus & vitam æternam; lib. 3. In vitam æternam; and lib. 4. Hoc sequitur in S. Symbolo quod omnia quæ credimus & speramus in Vita æterna percipiamus. And Carolus Magnus in his reprehension of Basilii B. sh. p of Ancyra. Non eo modo præjudicat præmissio imaginum adorationis sacræ fidei puritari, quæ interdicta potius quam instituta est; sicut præjudicant Remissio peccatorum, carnis Resurrectio, & Vita futuri sæculi, si in confessione præmittantur; quæ utique & in omni scripturarum serie prædicantur, & ab Apostolis in Symbolo laudabili brevitate connexæ tenentur, Cap. tul. lib. 3. cap. 6.*

former will follow the true Interpretation of this concluding Article; for thereby we are persuaded to look upon it as containing the state of man after the Resurrection in the world to come.

As therefore S. Paul hath taught us to expresse our belief of a Resurrection both of the just and unjust, so after the Resurrection we are to consider the condition of them both, of the one as risen to everlasting life, of the other as risen to everlasting punishment and contempt, & so those which first acknowledged this Article † did interpret it. Although therefore *Life everlasting*, as it is used in the Scriptures, belongeth to the just alone, and is never mentioned otherwise then as a reward promised and given to them who fear and serve the Lord, yet the same words may be used to expresse the duration of any persons which live never to dye again, whatsoever their state and condition in that life shall be. For as the *Resurrection of the dead* is taken in the Scriptures for the happy and eternal condition which followeth after it, as when the Apostle

† *As appeareth by those words of Chrysologus, Credimus vitam æternam, quia post Resurrectionem nec bonorum finis est nec malorum.*

saith, *If by any means I might attain unto the Resurrection of the dead*; which he must needs be most certain to attain unto who believed the Resurrection of the just and unjust, and therefore if he had spoken of the Resurrection in generall, as it belongeth unto all, he needed not that expression, *If by any means*, nor that which went before, *the fellowship of Christs sufferings*, for without them he should certainly rise from the dead, but he meant that Resurrection which followeth upon the being made conformable unto his death, which is a Resurrection in conformity to the Resurrection of Christ. As *Isay*, the Resurrection of the dead is taken in Scripture for everlasting happinesse, and yet the same language is and may be used for the generall resurrection of all men, even of such as shall be everlastingly unhappy; so *the Life everlasting* though used for a Reward given onely unto the Elect may yet be taken as comprehending the condition of the Reprobate also, understood barely for the duration of persons living.

Phil. 3. 11. Though in his place it is not barely ἀνάστασις, but ἑξανάστασις, εἰς τὴν ἑξανάστασιν τοῦ νεκρῶν, and in the Alexandrian Mss. εἰς τὴν ἑξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, which is the most ancient reading, as appeareth by the Vulgar Translation, Si modo occurrat ad resurrectionem quæ est ex mortuis, and the reading of Tertullian,

Si qua concurrat in Resurrectionem quæ est à mortuis, and the Syriack Translation, נחמיה בית דמן קיםא, yet the ἑξανάστασις of it self was taken for no more then ἀνάστασις by an. of the Translator. And S. Chrysostome did so understand it, as appeareth by these words upon the place, Εἶπας κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν, εἰς τὴν ἑξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν (which is the reading of the Alexandrian Mss.) τί λόγους; καὶ μὴ πάντες αὐτῆς τυγχάνουσιν, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας πάντες, οἱ μὲν εἰς πρῶτον, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐκδοκίαν καλῆς. Εἰ ποῖναι πάντες τῆς ἀνάστασις τυγχάνουσιν, καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασις μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθαρσίας, πῶς οἱ μὲλλον ἑξαίρεται πινὸς τυγχάνειν ἕλεος; οἱ ποῖ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίαν; By which it appeareth that S. Chrysostome took no notice of the word ἑξανάστασις, or of the phrase ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν, but as his interpretation of the Apostles intention addeth, ποῖαν ὀνταῦθα ἀνάστασιν φησὶ; τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγνοῦν τὸν Χριστόν. So also Theodoretus paraphrase, ἵνα μετὰ αὐτὸν καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασις. It is therefore I conceive a Notion peculiar to Theophrast among the Greeks, Πάντες ἀνίστανθαι καὶ μὴτοι πάντες ἑξάνιστανθαι.

All those then which shall rise from the dead shall rise to life, and after the resurrection live by a true vital union of their soules unto their bodies: and because that union shall never cease, because the parts united shall never be

dissolved, because it is *appointed for men once to dye*, and after the reviviscency never to dye again, it followeth that the life which they shall live, must be an *everlasting life*.

To begin then with the Resurrection to condemnation, the Truth included in this Article in reference unto that, is to this effect, that those which dye in their sins and shall be raised to life that they may appear before the Judgement seat of Christ, and shall there receive the sentence of condemnation, shall be continued in that life for ever to undergoe the punishment due unto their sins; in which two particulars are contained, the duration of their persons, and of their pains. For two wayes this Eternity may be denied, one by a destruction or annihilation of their persons, with which the torments must likewise cease; the other by a suspension or relaxation of the punishment, and a preservation of the persons, never to suffer the same pains again. Both of which are repugnant to the clear revelations of the Justice of God against the disobedience of man.

Our first Assertion therefore is, that the Wicked after the day of Judgement shall not be consumed or annihilated, but shall remain alive in soul and body to endure the torments to be inflicted upon them by the justice of God, for all the sins committed by them while they were in the body. They which of late oppose the eternall subsistence and misery of the wicked, strangely maintain their Opinion as a truth delivered in the Scriptures, as if the Word it self taught nothing but an annihilation of the enemies of God, and no lasting torment; as if all the threats and menaces of the justice and wrath of God were nothing else but what the scoffing Atheist expects, that is after death never to be again, or if they be, as it were in a moment to loose that being for ever. Because the Scripture speaks of them as of such as shall be destroyed, and perish, and dye; therefore they will give that comfort to them here, that though their life in which they sin be short,
yet

yet the time in which they are to be tormented for their sins shall be shorter far. They tell us where the Scripture mentioneth destruction in Hell, it speaks of perdition, but no torment there. In this sense will they understand those words of Christ, (so full of terrour in the true, so full of com'ort to the wicked in their exposition,) *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.* If this place speak, as those men would have it, of perdition onely, not of cruciation, then will it follow that God is not able to cruciate and torment a man in hell; for there can be no other reason why it must be spoken of perdition onely excluding cruciation, but because he is able to annihilate, not to cruciate. No, certainly a man may be said to be destroyed, and perish, to be lost, and dead, who is rejected, separated and disjoyned from God the better and the nobler life of man; and that person so denominated may still subsist, and be what in his own nature he was before, and live the life which doth consist in the vitall union of his soul and body; and so subsisting undergoe the wrath of God for ever. Nor shall any language, phrases or expressions give any comfort to the wicked, or strength to this Opinion, if the same Scriptures, which say the wicked shall be destroyed, and perish, and dye, say also that they shall be tormented with never dying pains, as they plainly and frequently doe.

Mat. 10. 28.
Locus Matthaei
10. 18. perditionem tantum animae in gehenna, non cruciatum denunciat, Smalcus contra Meisnerum.

Depart from me ye cursed, shall the Judge eternall say to all the Reprobate, *into everlasting fire;* and least any should imagine that the fire shall be eternall, but the torments not; it followeth, *and these shall goe away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.* Now if the fire be everlasting by which God punisheth the Reprobates, if the punishment inflicted be also everlasting, then must the Reprobates everlastingly subsist to endure that punishment, otherwise there would be a punish-

Mat. 25. 41, 46.

ment inflicted and none endured, which is a contradiction. Indeed the eternity of that fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels is a sufficient demonstration of the eternity of such as suffer in it, and the question onely can be what that eternity doth signifie; for because some things are called in the Scriptures eternall which have but a limited or determined duration, therefore some may imagine the fire of hell to be in that sense eternall, as lasting to the time appointed by God for the duration of it. But as the Fire is termed eternall, so that eternity is described as absolute, excluding all limits, prescinding from all determinations. The end of the burning of fire is by extinguishing, and that which cannot be extinguished can never end; but such is the fire which shall torment the Reprobate; for he, whose *fan is in his hand shall burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire*; and hath taught us before, that *it is better to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire, to goe into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched*; and hath further yet explained himself by that unquestionable addition, and undeniable description of the place of torments, *Where the worm dyeth not, and the fire is not quenched*. And that we may be yet further assured that this fire shall be never extinguished, we read that *the smoak of their torment ascenderh up for ever and ever*, and that those which are cast into the *lake of fire and brimstone, shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*. If then the fire in which the Reprobates are to be tormented be everlasting, if so absolutely everlasting that it shall never be quenched, if so certainly never to be quenched, that the smoak thereof shall ascend for ever and ever, if those which are cast into it shall be tormented for ever and ever, (all which the Scriptures expressly teach) then shall the wicked never be so consumed as to be annihilated, but shall subsist for ever, and be coeternall to the tormenting flames.

Neither doth this onely prove the eternity of infernall pains,

Mat. 3. 12.

Luc. 3. 17.

Mat. 18. 8.

Mar. 9. 43, 44.

Rev. 14. 11.

20. 10.

pains, but clearly refute the onely materiall Argument brought against it, which is laid upon this ground, that the Wicked after the Resurrection shall be punished with death, and that a second death, and so they shall be no more, nor can in any sense be said to live or subsist. For the enduring of this fire is that very death, and they are therefore said to dye the second death because they endure eternall torments. *He that overcometh shall not be hurt by the*

Rev. 2. 11.

second death; it seems that they which shall dye that death shall be hurt by it, whereas if it were annihilation, and so a conclusion of their torments, it would be no way hurtfull or injurious, but highly beneficiall to them. But the living torments are the second death. For *death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire, this is the second death, Who- soever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire,* this is the second death. The Jewes be-

fore our Saviour's time believed there was a second death, and though it were not expressed in the Oracles themselves which were committed to them, yet in the received *† Exposition* of them it was often mentioned, and that as the punishment of the wicked in the life to come; & what this punishment shall be, was in these words revealed to S. John *But the fearfull and unbelieving, and the abominable & murderers and whoremongers and sorcerers and idolaters,*

† The Chaldee Paraphrase maketh of this mention of it, as Deut. 33. 6. Let Ruben live and not dye, he expoundeth thus, *וְיִרְאוּן בְּחַיָּיָם* וְיָמוֹתָם

: רְחוֹבָן בְּעוֹלָמָא דְּהַדִּין Let Ruben live in life of the World, and not dye the second death. So the Targum of Onkelos. The Jerusalem Targum more expressly, *וְיִרְאוּן בְּעוֹלָמָא דְּהַדִּין וְיָמוֹתָם בְּמִיחָנָא חֲנִינָא דְּבַה מִיחָן דְּעָטִיָּא לְעֵלְכָא* : *וְיָמוֹתָם חֲנִינָא* Let Ruben live in this world, and let him not dye the second death which the wicked dye in the world to come. So Esay 22. 14. Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye dye. *אִם יִשְׁתַּבַּח חֲבָא דְּהַדִּין לִכְּוֹן טַר דִּי תִּמְוֹתוֹן* : *וְיָמוֹתָם חֲנִינָא* and 65. 6. I will not keep silence but will recompense, even recompense into their bosome. *לֹא אֶחָד לֵהֶן אֶחָד בְּחַיָּיָם אֱלֹהִין אֲשֶׁלֶּם לֵהֶן* : *לֹא אֶחָד לֵהֶן אֶחָד בְּחַיָּיָם אֱלֹהִין אֲשֶׁלֶּם לֵהֶן* I will not give them an end in this life but will recompense them with vengeance for their sins, and deliver their bodies to the second death. From these and the like places it appeareth that the Jewes believed that the wicked after death should be delivered to a second death, that this death should be in the world to come, that they should by this death be punished for their sin, and S. John revealed that this punishment shall be by everlasting burnings.

and

REV. 21. 8.

and all lyars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death. Now if the part in the lake be the second death, if that part be a perpetuall permanſion in torment, as before is proved; then to ſay that the wicked ſhall dye the ſecond death is not a confutation of their eternall being in miſery, but an aſſertion of it, becauſe it is the ſame thing delivered in other terms.

† ΟΛΛΗΜΑ, πε-
rrii.

2 Theſſ. I. 8, 9.

And if the pretence of death will not prove an annihilation, or inferre a concluſion of torment, much leſſe will the bare phraſes of *perdition* and *deſtruction*; for we may as well conclude that whoſoever ſayes he is † *undone*, intends thereby that he ſhall be no more: beſide, the eternity of deſtruction in the language of the Scripture ſignifies a perpetuall perſeſſion and duration in miſery. For when Chriſt ſhall come to *take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, they ſhall be puniſhed with everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. Wherefore I conclude that the wicked ſhall riſe to everlaſting puniſhment, continuing both in ſoul and body under the wrath of God and the torments proceeding from it, never to be quitted of them by annihilation; which is our firſt Aſſertion.

The ſecond Aſſertion teacheth us that as the Reprobates ſhall never fail to endure the torments due unto their ſins, ſo the Juſtice of God will never fail to inflict thoſe torments for ther ſins. They ſhall never live to pay the uttermoſt farthing, they ſhall never come to the dayes of reſreſhment who are caſt into perpetuall burnings. One part of their miſery is the horroure of deſpair, and it were not perfect Hell if any hope could lodge in it. The favour of God is not to be obtained where there is no means left to obtain it; but in the world to come there is no place for faith, nor virtue in repentance. If there be now ſuch a vaſt diſtance between the tormenting flames and *Abrahams* boſome,

bosome, that none could passe from one to other; what impossibility must there be when the finall sentence is past upon all. As certainly as no person once received into the heavenly mansions shall ever be cast into outer darkness, so certainly none which is once cast into the fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels, shall ever enter into their Masters joy. As the tree falleth so it lyeth: there is no change to be wrought in man within those flames, no purgation of his sin, no sanctification of his nature, no justification of his person, and therefore no salvation of him. Without the mediation of Christ no man shall ever enter into heaven, and when he hath *delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father*. then shall the office of the Mediator cease. So groundlesse was the Opinion of *Origen*, who conceived that after some number of yeares the damned should be released from their torment, and made partakers of the joyes of heaven. For certainly their condition is unalterable, their condemnation irreversibile, their torments inevitable, their miseries eternall. As they shall not be taken from their punishment by annihilation of themselves. which is our first, so the punishment shall not be taken off them by any compassion upon them, which is our second Assertion.

To conclude this branch of the Article, I conceive these certain & infallible doctrines in Christianity. That the wicked after this life shall be punished for their sins, so that in their punishment there shall be a demonstration of the Justice of God. That to this end they shall be raised again to life, and shall be judged and condemned by Christ and delivered up to be tormented with the Devil and his Angels. That the punishment which shall be inflicted on them shall be proportionate to their sins, as a recompense of their demerits. That they shall be tormented with a pain or losse; the losse from God from whose presence they are cast out, the pain from themselves in a despair of enjoying him, and regret for losing him. That they further shall be

tormented with the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire. That their persons shall continue for ever in this remediless condition, under an everlasting pain of losse, because there is no hope of heaven, under an eternall pain of sense, because there is no means to appease the wrath of God which abideth on them. Thus the *Athanasian Creed*, *They that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.*

The next Relation of this Article to the former is in reference to the Resurrection of the Just; and then *the life everlasting* is not to be taken in a vulgar and ordinary sense, but raised to the constant language of the Scriptures, in which it signifieth all which God hath promised, which Christ hath purchased, and with which man shall be rewarded in the world to come.

Now this life eternall may be looked upon under three considerations; as Initiall, as Partiall, and as Perfectionall. I call that Eternall Life *Initiall*, which is obtained in this life, and is as it were an earnest of that which is to follow; of which our Saviour spake, *He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, & shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.* I call that *Partiall*, which belongeth though to the nobler, yet but a part of man, that is the soul of the just separated from the body. I dispute not whether the joyes be partiall as to the soul, I am sure they are but partiall as to the man. For this life consisteth in the happiness which is conferred on the Soul departed in the fear, and admitted to the presence, of God. *S. Paul* had a desire to depart and to be with Christ, he was willing rather to travail and be absent from the body, and to be present and at home with the Lord: and certainly where Saint Paul desired to be when he departed, there he then was, and there now is, and that not alone, but with all them which

John 5. 24.

Phil. 1. 23.

2 Cor. 5. 8.

which ever departed in the same faith with him, and that is with Christ who sitteth at the right hand of God. This happinesse which the Saints enjoy between the hour of their death and the last day, is the *Partiall* life eternall. Thirdly, I call that *Perfectionall* which shall be conferred upon the Elect immediately after the blessing pronounced by Christ. *Come ye blessed children of my Father, Receive the Kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

This *Eternall life* is to be considered in the Possession, and in the Duration; in the first as it is *life*, in the second as it is *eternall*. Now this life is not onely naturall, that is, the union of the soul to the body, which is the life of the Reprobate; but spirituall, which consisteth in the union of the soul to God, as our Saviour speakes, *He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.* And it is called after an especiall manner *Life*, because of the happinesse which attendeth it: and therefore to understand that life, is to know, so far as it is revealed, in what that happinesse doth consist.

To begin with that which is most intelligible; The bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection shall be transformed into spirituall and incorruptible bodies. The flesh is *sown in corruption, raised in incorruption, sown in dishonour, raised in glory, sown in weaknesse, raised in power, sown a naturall body rais'd a spirituall body.* This perfective alteration shall be made by the Son of God *who shall change our v^l body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.* Thus when we come into that other world, the world of Spirits, even our bodies shall be spirituall.

As for the better part of man, the soul, it shall be highly exalted to the utmost perfection in all the parts and faculties thereof. The Understanding shall be raised to the utmost capacity, and that capacity completely filled. Now

• Cor. 13. 12.

Joh. 3. 2.

we see through a glasse darkly . but then face to face ; now we know but in part . but then shall we know even as also we are known . And this even now we know , that when God shall appear we shall be like him , for we shall see him as he is . Our first temptation was that we should be like unto God in knowledge , and by that we fell ; but being raised by Christ we come to be truly like him , by knowing him as we are known , and by seeing him as he is . Our Wills shall be perfected with absolute and indefectible holinessse , with exact conformity to the will of God , and perfect liberty from all servitude of sin . They shall be troubled with no doubtfull choice , but with their radicall and fundamentall freedome shall fully embrace the greatest good . Our affections shall be all set right by an unalterable regulation , and in that regularity shall receive absolute satisfaction ; and all this shall be effected that we may be thereby made capable , and then happy by a full fruition .

To this internall perfection is added a proportionately happy condition , consisting in an absolute freedome from all pain , misery , labour , and want ; an impossibility of sinning and offending God ; an hereditary possession of all good , with an unspeakable complacency and joy flowing from it , and all this redounding from the vision and fruition of God ; This is the *Life* .

And now the *Duration* of this life is as necessary as the life it self , because to make all already mentioned amount unto a true felicity , there must be added an absolute security of the enjoyment , void of all fear of losing it or being deprived of it . And this is added , to complete our happinessse , by the adjection of Eternity . Now that this life shall be eternall we are assured who have not yet obtain'd it , and they much more who do enjoy it . He which hath purchased it for us and promised it unto us , offereth it *eternall life* ; it is described as a *continuing city , as everlasting habitations , as an house eternall in the heavens ,*

Heb. 13. 14.

Luc. 16. 9.

2 Cor. 5. 1.

heavens; it is expressed by *eternall glory, eternall salvation, by an eternall inheritance, incorruptible, undissolved and that fadeth not away, by the everlastinge kingdome of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* And lest we should be discouraged by any short or lame interpretation of eternity, it is further explained in such terms as are lyable to no mistake. For our Saviour hath said, *If a man keep my saying he shall never see death. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall not dye.* When God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes there shall be no more death; and where there is life and no death, there must be everlasting life.

1 Pet. 5. 10.

Heb. 9. 9.

9. 15.

1 Pet. 1. 4.

2 Pet. 1. 11.

Joh. 8. 51.

11. 26.

Rev. 21. 4.

The belief of this Article is Necessary, as to the eternity of torment, to deterre us from committing sin, and to quicken us to a speedy repentance for sin committed. *For the wages of sin is death;* nothing can bring us to those everlasting flames but sin unrepented of; nothing can save that man from the never-dying worm who dyeth in his finnes.

Secondly, the belief of eternall pains after death is Necessary to breed in us a fear and awe of the great God; and to teach us to tremble at his word to consider the infinity of his Justice, and the fierceness of his wrath, to meditate on the power of his menaces, the validity of his threats, to follow that directi^on, to embrace that reduplicated advice of our Saviour, *I will forwarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell. yea I say unto you, Fear him.*

Luc. 12. 5.

Thirdly this belief is Necessary to teach us to make a full estimate of the price of Christ's blood, to value sufficiently the work of our Redemption, to acknowledge and admire the love of God to us in Christ. For he which believeth not the eternity of torments to come can never sufficiently value that ransom by which we were redeemed from them, or be proportionately thankfull to his Redeemer by whose intervention we hath escaped them.

Fffif 3

Again,

Again, as this Article followeth upon the Resurrection of the just, and containeth in it an eternall duration of infinite felicity belonging to them, it is Necessary to stir us up to an earnest desire of that righteousness to which such a life is promised, to a carefull and constant performance of those commands to which such a reward is so graciously promised. For as all our happinesse proceedeth from the vision of God, so we are certain that without holinesse no man shall see him.

Col. 3. 2, 3.

Mat. 6. 21.

Phil. 3. 13, 14.

Secondly, this belief is necessary to take off our inclinations and desires from the pleasures and profits of this life; to breed in us a contempt of the world, and to teach us to despise all things on this side heaven; to *set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth*, considering we *are dead, and our life is hid with Christ in God*. For where *our treasure is, there will our heart be also*. Therefore we must *forget those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, presse toward the mark, for the price of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus*.

Rom. 8. 18.

2 Cor. 4. 17, 18.

Thindly, an Assent unto this Truth is necessary to encourage us to take up the Crosse of Christ, and to support us under it; willingly and chearfully to undergo the afflictions and tribulations of this life, *reckoning with the Apostle, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us*; and knowing that *our light affliction which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternall weight of glory*: and this knowledge is not to be obtained, this comfort is not to be expected, except we *look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen*; for the things which are seen are temporall, but the things which are not seen are eternall.

And now having thus shewed the propriety proved the verity, and declared the necessity of this Article, we may fully instruct every Christian how to expresse his belief in the

the last object of his faith, which he may most fitly thus pronounce. I do fully and freely assent unto this as unto a most necessary and infallible truth, that the unjust after their Resurrection and Condemnation shall be tormented for their sins in hell, and shall so be continued in torments for ever, so as neither the Justice of God shall ever cease to inflict them, nor the perions of the wicked cease to subsist and suffer them: and that the Just after their Resurrection and Absolution shall enter into their Masters joy, freed from all possibility of sin and sorrow, filled with all conceivable and inconceivable fullnesse of happinesse, confirmed in an absolute security of an eternall enjoyment, and so they shall continue with God and with the Lamb for evermore. And thus I believe *the Life everlasting.*

F I N I S.



